

# The Classical Review

OCTOBER 1898.

*The Editor of the CLASSICAL REVIEW will be glad to receive short paragraphs (or materials for such paragraphs) upon classical topics of current interest. These should reach him as early as possible in the month preceding the publication of the REVIEW.*

THE classical event of the summer is the appearance of the first instalment of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. A most lively and various progeny this, which Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, with Prof. Blass as accoucheur-in-chief, have given to the world! Its interest lies perhaps not so much in the illumination which its scraps of extant classical works—and imprimis the now famous fragment of Thucydides—throw upon Greek textual history and criticism, nor in the excitement of discoveries like the portions of a treatise upon metre and the twenty restored verses of Sappho, an *etwa verblasstes Gedicht* if one may say so without disrespect: but in the window which it opens upon the living ancient world. Here we may read the authentic account of the last scene in the career of the condemned rebel Heliodorus, and witness the unequal conflict between Egyptian bravado and imperial dignity. Is our taste for more domestic incidents? There is the litigation between Pesouris the father and the nurse about the parentage of her foster-child. If we delight in the unconsciously humorous official, we may learn how the medical officer notifies the strategus of the nome that, having been directed to inspect the body of a man who had died from hanging, he found him hanged by a noose and reports accordingly. Here, too, are all sorts of epistles, the ruffled schoolboy's ill-spelt effusion to papa, the formal epistle of the outraged

NO. CVIII. VOL. XII.

father who gives his *congé* to his son-in-law elect, invitations to a wedding breakfast or to dinner at the club.

When we have read all these, we shall probably be conscious and a little ashamed of the partly priggish and partly dollish Greek in which we should ourselves have had to express our quotidian wants if the modern practice of ancient composition bore any relation to actual life and living entities. This, however, is not precisely the complaint of the preface to *Musa Clauda*, the modest title of a book of translations into Latin elegiacs by Messrs. Owen and Phillimore. They say it is 'to be regretted that the practice of verse composition has declined in England, and it is significant that a marked decline in English scholarship is coincident with this. Theorists and specialists we have many: scholars are a dwindling quantity.' The lament comes from Oxford where verse composition should have all the fragrance of the violet, as it certainly has enjoyed all its seclusion; and of its local truth the *fidicines* of the Isis must judge themselves. But so far as I can estimate the general position, the decline, if any, in the practice of versifying, has been accompanied by a noticeable rise in its standard. Less perhaps may be written; but what is, is more strictly judged and on the whole better worth the writing. Both in fidelity and in accuracy there has been a gain, and not a

c c

few 'fair copies' which did well enough twenty years ago could hardly pass muster now.

But 'the marked decline in English scholarship.' That is more serious; but frankly we do not believe in it. The 'nineties' certainly stand in marked contrast to the 'fifties' and 'sixties.' The mode of work has changed. Those earlier decades were discursive: the present one is concentrative. The difference is an inevitable result of the expansion in the field of classical learning and of a more general recognition of the importance of minute and conscientious research. The number of English workers in our field has greatly increased. To see this we need only compare the list of the contributors to the *Journal of Philology*, say twenty-five years ago, with that of present contributors to the same journal and to the *Classical Review*. This multitude is itself a sign of vigour. It is clearly the duty of our educators at school and at the universities to ensure that specialism does not begin too soon; and not less clearly a matter of individual prudence not so to devote one's self to any department, however wide its ramifications, as to lose capacity and inclination for everything besides. But it is idle, in the present cycle at any rate, to expect that a mature student will not work by preference at what he knows best and at what interests him most. We need have no great apprehension about the future. Your true Englishman is a dilettante in grain.

It is well known that at both the older Universities there is considerable dissatisfaction with the classical honours curriculum. At Cambridge the position is the more acute. After a long series of sittings the Board for Classics finally in May last elaborated a scheme; there was a time fuse attached to the bomb to explode in October. At Oxford three desperadoes have assailed the time-honoured arrangements of 'Mods' and 'Greats' in a series of proposals which will be dealt with in the same Michaelmas Term. The friends of classics will do well to watch events at both these seats of learning.

It is no secret that one of the causes of this ferment is the prospective Anglo-Indian, to whom neither the Oxford nor the Cambridge course is altogether convenient. Every one will be glad to see the way smoothed for the directors of our Indian

Empire to take their fill in the groves of Academe; but the public will not be pleased if in their pursuit of competition wallahs the Universities forget their own ancient ideals.

The following observations by Mr. W. M. Lindsay, who has recently returned from the United States, upon classical studies there will be read with interest.

'At school the classical training given in America is greatly inferior to ours. In Latin the schoolboy scarcely gets beyond Cæsar, Livy and Virgil; in Greek, beyond Homer, Xenophon, and perhaps Euripides. It seemed to me that the almost total absence of entrance scholarships (in our sense of the term) at the Universities has the effect of making schoolmasters satisfied with a Pass rather than a Class standard. The want of a thorough grounding in Latin and Greek puts classical students at the American Universities at a great disadvantage. Nor does the American Honours man seem to read classical authors on his own account so much as is done at Oxford and Cambridge. In fact I doubt whether even the best American students, at the time of graduation, know so many Latin and Greek books as the candidates for our University Prizes in their first year. Ignorance of 'quantities' is a common failing, due only in part to the absence of Verse Composition; for in Greek the accentual pronunciation which makes ἀνθρωπος a dactyl and σοφία a bacchius has certainly something to do with it.'

'But the point in which we are inferior to our transatlantic cousins is postgraduate work. For three, or it may be four, years the best classical graduates go through a higher course of study, which includes subsidiary subjects like Palaeography and Textual Criticism, Epigraphy, Archaeology, and perhaps Comparative Philology. In the Classical Seminary they get that acquaintance with methods of work and with bibliography which enables any one who has ability, inclination and leisure, to extend the bounds of classical knowledge after he has left the University. This postgraduate course is in preparation for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, a necessary qualification for the higher educational posts; and to obtain this Degree a thesis is usually required that embodies some original research. The uninteresting nature of the thesis is often complained of. But it is no fault of the system if a candidate, feeling himself unequal to higher flights, has to descend to a mere

collection of statistics, useful indeed in its way, but hardly interesting or inspiring. The wider a candidate's reading and the better his previous education, the more adequate will be his thesis.'

For the following paragraph I am indebted to my colleague, Prof. Seymour. In England too it is not so long ago that the Greek question was lowering over us; but the storm has passed—for the moment.

'Most readers of the *Classical Review* are aware that several of the most prominent of the Universities of the United States are discussing the removal of the requirement of Greek for the degree of bachelor of arts. In this connexion, and in its bearing on higher classical studies in America, although it belongs strictly to what is called secondary education, it is interesting to learn that a reaction in favour of the classics has sprung up where it was least expected—in the southern and western states, and under the

influence of the State Universities, which used to be thought the centres and hot-beds of the practical spirit of the times. In the extreme west, in California, three times as many persons are studying Greek as three years ago; in Wisconsin about four times as many are studying Greek as five years ago; while in Mississippi, though four years ago only two schools taught Greek, now Greek has been introduced into thirty-five schools. A similar report of encouragement comes from the extreme south, from Texas. The schools of Chicago are introducing Latin to a degree unknown before, and, according to the superintendent of these schools, with the best results. Thus many schools, which have had but a four years' course on Latin hitherto, now have a five or six years' course. The new interest in classical studies in the central, western, and southern parts of the United States may be expected to exert a strong influence on the institutions of the east.'

## VARIA.

I.—THE SLAVES IN THE *Wasps*.

My friend Mr. R. A. Neil, of Pembroke College, Cambridge, in conversation recently expressed the idea that in Aristophanes *Veep*. 433 two slaves are summoned, and not three.

ὦ Μίδα καὶ Φρύξ βοῖθαι δέῃρο καὶ Μασυντία,  
καὶ λάβεσθε τουνού.

This view prompted the following notes, in which I have the advantage of using suggestions of his.

The two slaves who speak in the *Wasps*, Xanthias and Sosias, are the two persons summoned in 433. They are summoned in a line of somewhat mock-heroic tone:<sup>1</sup> 'Midas Phryx, hither to my aid, and thou Masyntias.' Then in the following line both are addressed in the plural, and in 453 in

the dual, as Mr. Neil points out. That Midas Phryx is a single slave, and not two separate slaves, is shown by the singular βοῖθαι. The usual view is that Midas and Phryx are two distinct slaves, and Masyntias a third, while Xanthias and Sosias are a fourth and fifth; and the latter pair are understood to be referred to in 453. Mr. Starkie in his learned edition takes this view. He defends 433 (βοῖθαι) by quoting other cases where a singular imperative is employed when two or three persons have been addressed by name; but his examples are not so bold as this case, where we have first Midas Phryx summoned with a singular imperative, then Masyntias called, and then a plural imperative addressed to them both. Still the argument based on the βοῖθαι would not be conclusive, if it stood alone: but there are more weighty reasons.

If only two slaves are summoned in this line, it is clearly implied that they are barbarians: one is a Phrygian, and the other of some uncertain nationality. Now the two slaves, who speak in this comedy, are clearly marked out as foreigners: Xanthias is obviously a Lycian, 'the man from Xanthos' (Xanthos a Lycian slave is mentioned in the remarkable inscription found at Laurion, see Foucart *Associations Relig-*

<sup>1</sup> On the meaning of this line, see the sequel. For two slaves again in Aristoph., Mr. Neil quotes *Aves* 656-7, ἄγε δὲ, Ξανθία καὶ Μανόδωρε, λαμβάνετε τὰ στρώματα: probably Μανόδωρος is the slave called Μανὴς in 1311 and 1329. Here also we seem to have a Lycian and a Phrygian: on Manes see *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, i. pp. 294, 626. Mr. J. F. White mentions to me Eur. *Alc.* 675, Ἀνδρὲν ἢ Φρύγα ἀργυρώ-νητον.

*ieuses*, p. 219): Sosias<sup>1</sup> is a Phrygian, and his name may possibly be associated with the Phrygo-Pisidian god who bears the Hellenized name Sozon. The Phrygian nationality of Sosias is marked in unmistakable fashion in the opening scene, where Xanthias says to him

ἀλλ' ἢ παραφρονεῖς ἐπεὶ δὲ κορυβανταῖς;

The Korybantes were a Phrygian analogue to the Cretan Kouretes (Preller *Griech. Mythologie*, i. p. 542: Lucian *de Salt.* 8 and 79); and societies called Korybantes were probably attached to some of the Phrygian *hierai* (*Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, i. Pt. ii. p. 359).

The answer of Sosias makes his nationality still clearer:

ὅ οὐκ, ἀλλ' ἔνθ' ἵππος μ' ἔχει τις ἐκ Σαβαζίου,

'a sleep sent by Sabazios (the Phrygian god) has taken hold of me.' It has been suggested that the name Sozon is a Grecized form of a native name Saoazos, which has also given origin to the ordinary Greek term for this deity, Sabazios (*Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, i. p. 264); and this suggestion has been approved by some high authority (Petersen in Lanckoronski *Städte Pamphyliens*, ii. p. 8). If it be true, then our derivation of Sosias, as the 'man of Sozon—Saoazos,' lends further point to the phrase ἐκ Σαβαζίου.

The Phrygian nationality of Sosias was, in all probability, made obvious to the spectators by dress and general equipment; otherwise lines 8 f. and 433 would have less point. This makes it probable that the conjecture Φρυγί<sup>2</sup> for τρυγί in 1309 is right. The very word Φρύξ is almost equivalent to 'slave'; and, in this case, when one of the characters on the stage is a Phrygian slave, the allusion to 'a Phrygian newly grown rich' is all the more effective.

Now, what is the meaning of 433? Mr. Starkie, in his elaborate and learned notes, seems to imply that the innuendo is, 'Thou, Midas, and thou brutal one, come to my aid, and thou gormandizer; and lay hold of this fellow.' His note on Φρύξ seems to me not

to prove more than that Phryx is a characteristic name for 'slave,' and connotes the slave nature as distinguished from the freeman's nature; while he illustrates *Μασωντία* by a number of words (indicating 'gormandizer') which have no resemblance to it except that they begin with MA.

Line 433 seems to be a mock-heroic invocation, 'thou Midas, who art also Phryx, to my aid! and thou Masyntias.' I know no expression exactly similar to *Μίδα καὶ Φρύξ*. But, inasmuch as the nominative would be, according to the well-known idiom, *Μίδας ὁ καὶ Φρύξ*<sup>3</sup> the vocative can hardly be anything except *Μίδα καὶ Φρύξ*. Some may prefer to avoid this unusual form by adopting Schneider's conjecture ὦ *Μίδα καὶ Φρύξ*; but this seems to me to sacrifice a most interesting grammatical feature and characteristic turn of expression: 'Thou named Midas and Phryx, i.e. bearing the alternative names Midas (the King) in Phrygia and Phryx (the Slave) in Greece.' Schneider's conjecture, however, might also give a fair sense 'Midas's son Phryx, i.e. King's son Slave,'<sup>4</sup> but the other seems far more effective.

Masyntias is obscure, but may be a parallel term, denoting Xanthias in mock-heroic style. Lycia and the relations of Lycia to Greece in the end of the fifth century are so obscure that we cannot understand its exact sense. May it be a sort of patronymic indicating Xanthias's descent from an ancient Xanthian hero or king, or an epithet derived from some local name? It is not improbable that some legend of the great Lycian city may have been known in Athens at the time when Athens ruled the Aegean Sea and controlled the sea-borne trade of all the Aegean lands; and that in later time, when Athenian relations with Lycia had almost ceased, this legend was no longer understood in the Greek city. We do not even know what is the Lycian name which was Grecized as *Ξάνθος*, but there is a certain resemblance between the second part of *Μασωντία* and the name *Ξανθίας*. The city was also called Arne, and coins were struck with the Lycian

<sup>3</sup> This formula is too common to need illustration: it was far commoner in the half-Greek countries than in Greece proper (Böckh on *C.I.G.* 2090), for it strictly belongs to the bilingual countries (*Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, i. Pt. ii. p. 637 f; *St. Paul the Trav.* p. 81 ff.). Hence the phrase has a foreign ring, suitable to the general tone of the line. Strictly, it denotes an 'alternative name': see II.

<sup>4</sup> It is probable that Schneider intends his conjecture to mean 'O Midas, Phrygian slave'; but my concern is to take what seems the least objectionable meaning of which the Greek words are capable, not the meaning which Schneider attributes to them. I know the conjecture only from Mr. Starkie's notes.

<sup>1</sup> Sosias a slave name in Athenaeus, xi. p. 469 (Comedy of Philémon), Wescher-Foucart *Inscr. rec. à Delphes* no 429 (a Galatian slave manumitted) and many others, Plantus *Amph.* (from a Greek original), Ter. *Andria* (a freedman). On slave-names, see III.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Starkie's apt quotation from Lucian makes the conjecture almost a certainty, as he says.



legend (in genitive) Ἀρρναῖα (Hill, *British Museum Catalogue: Lycia*, p. 22 f.).

The form *Macurtia* occurs in R, while V has *Macurtia*. It is a question whether V may not here be right: forms in -ύς and -όας, though not common elsewhere, are characteristic of south-western Asia Minor, e.g. *Κιδραμόας*, *Ποναμόας*, *Ὀπραμόας*, *Καδοῖας*, and many other names in inscriptions.<sup>1</sup>

It is therefore most probable that in 433 a double-named Phrygian slave and a Lycian slave are mentioned; and it is certain that Sosias and Xanthias were respectively Phrygian and Lycian. Hence it would appear that only two slaves are mentioned in the *Wasps*, though their ordinary names are varied in a mock-heroic apostrophe in l. 433.

The use of the double name with καί, which must here, by a common idiom, be interpreted by the English 'or,' suggests some further remarks, in the following section.

A word may be added as to the probable connexion of the word. The name Masyntias or Masintuas seems to be a derivative from Masas, which occurs as a personal name in the south-western regions of Asia Minor: it is found along with Opramoas, a name of thoroughly Lycian type, on the frontiers of Phrygia and Pisidia, see *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* i. pp. 269, 272,<sup>2</sup> it is not mentioned in Pape-Benseler, nor in the index to *C.I.G.* Masa as a feminine name seems to occur at Iconium, *C.I.G.* 3998, and Masa as masculine is found in the bilingual Lycian inscription Limyra No. 38 (*C.I.G.* 4315 l. Schmidt 42), see Torp, *Lykische Beiträge*, 1898, p. 42. The name Masas was purely native Asianic; and hence there is much diversity of inflexion when it is written in Greek: genitives *Μασᾶ*, *Μασᾶδος*, and *Μασάντος* all occur in the examples quoted. Masaris, a Carian title of Dionysos (quoted by Stephanus Byz. s.v. *Μασαραπία*), may be connected with it.

Just as we find the personal name Kadouas or Kadauas (*Cit. and Bish.* i. p. 314) and the place name Kaduanda, the

divine name Thyia(?) and Thiounta (*Cit. and Bish.* i. p. 144), or the place names Sala and Salouda, Sbida and Sibidunda (or Sibidinda), Kys and Kyinda, Oinia and Oinoanda, Karya and Karyanda etc., so it is possible that beside Masa or Masas there should be a local name Masinda or Masynda, in which τ might be as readily used in Greek transcriptions as δ (as in Thiounta). Then Masinta or Masynta would give a personal or ethnic name Masintyas or Masyntias, as Trokonda gives Trokondas, Kidramos Kidramoas, and a host of others.<sup>3</sup>

In the preceding remarks much is tentative and uncertain; but they are printed in the hope of attracting criticism and improvement.

The observation made by Miss White in the *Classical Review*, May, 1898, p. 209 (since most of this paper was in the editor's hands), that Xanthias is the clever, and Sosias the stupid slave in the *Wasps*, is in harmony with my argument. The Phrygians were reckoned by the Greeks to be slaves by nature, because Nature had made them dull and slow.

## II.—καί MEANING 'OR.'

If the suggestion just advanced in a very hesitating way as to the construction ὁ Μῆδᾶ καὶ Φρύξ be right, this is the most extreme form known to me of the use of καί connecting alternative names, corresponding to *sive* or *seu* in Latin; but it is, also, the solitary instance known to me of a person being addressed by the vocative of his two names. There is great need of some systematic treatment of the naming and double naming in the Greek, and more especially the Grecized lands of western Asia, where double or triple names, strictly alternative names, used as a rule in different circumstances, were common.

The use of the alternative name must be carefully distinguished from the double or longer names used by Greeks in the later centuries in imitation of the Roman system of nomenclature with *nomen* and one or more *cognomina*; and yet the distinction is sometimes ignored by modern scholars. There are, indeed, cases where the alternative name is hardly to be distinguished from the double name: the former custom gradually fell into disuse, while the latter became more common

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Buresch (whose early death is a great sorrow to all who are interested in Asia Minor) has some excellent remarks on the relations of Asianic place and personal names in his just-published *Asia Lydica*, but at the moment I cannot find the reference.

<sup>1</sup> These are often formed from names of cities (Kidramos, Kadoi). Mr. Neil adds Panamyas son of Casbolis in the Lygdamis Inscr. of Halicarnassus. Examyas is given as Thales's father in Diog. Laert. Kretschmer in *Einl. in d. Gesch. d. Griech. Sprache*, p. 332 takes the affix as -μῦνα, μῦας, -μῦας, -μῦης. Probably Panamyas was Grecized from the native Pounamouas so as to imply 'the man born in Panamos-month.' Compare Zeus Panamaros, Grecized into Panēmerios. Should we read Hexamyas, a *kosenname* for ἑξαμήριος?

<sup>2</sup> On p. 269, l. 9, in the remarks on the name, the word 'perhaps' has got out of place: it should come five words later, after 'compare.'

as time went on; and in many cases, owing to want of knowledge of the facts, we cannot tell whether a person mentioned in some inscription by two names has the alternative or the double name.

Another difficulty is caused by the Roman *praenomina*. These were often taken as names by Romanized Greeks: e.g. Greeks often bear the name Markos, or Loukios, or Sextos. This must not be confused with cases where a Greek acquired Roman citizenship and necessarily took a name of the complete Roman type, as Tiberios Klaudios Mithridates. Yet here again the distinction is confused; and the custom, which began about A.D. 215, of using Aurelios as a *praenomen* to mark the citizenship acquired in virtue of Caracalla's action in widening the *civitas*, is often mixed up with the other custom, which originated much earlier, of using Aurelios either as a name after the Greek fashion, or as the *nomen* of a Greek who acquired the citizenship and took a proper Roman name, such as M. Aurelios Philippikos.

The alternative name originated in bilingual and half-Hellenized countries, when people had often a sort of double life and double nature, and took a name in each language.<sup>1</sup> The names were really alternative: the most characteristic expression of them is *ὁ καὶ* in Greek, and *sive* in Latin.<sup>2</sup> But Latin often borrows the Greek form, and uses the expression *qui et*, whose non-Latin character is shown by the fact that it is declined (regardless of grammar) *τῷ καὶ* = *cui et*, and so on. 'Ἀπολλωνίῳ τῷ καὶ Ἰουλίῳ' is good idiomatic Greek; but *Apollonio cui et Julio* is, certainly, grecizing Latin. Accordingly, *Μῦδας ὁ καὶ Φρύξ* would be the full expression of an alternative name in the nominative. It will be gathered from the origin of the alternative name that it was practically confined to free citizens, and that to use it of a slave implied something of a mocking or mock-heroic strain (as we have already seen from other considerations).

As we have nothing similar in nature in English to the alternative name, we cannot translate it precisely: but the nearest ap-

proach to the sense is to use '*alias*' or '*or*.' The Greeks think of the person as bearing the name A and in other circumstances the name B; we think of him as 'A or B,' A *alias* B; and the Romans similarly use *sive*. Such is the rule laid down in the manuals of epigraphy, e.g. Cagnat, *Manuel d'Épigraphie Romaine*, p. 57, Marquardt *Röm. Privatalterthümer*<sup>3</sup>, p. 27, and accepted by every one except some Theologians of the so-called 'critical' school in Germany.

I should apologize for wasting the space of the *Classical Review* in such elementary statements; but it is forced on me, because when in another place I pointed out that it is a common practice in Greek to use *καὶ* to connect two alternative names or epithets applied to the same person or place or thing, I was rebuked in no measured terms in a well-known and esteemed German theological journal by a Swiss Professor, who seems to have so entirely concentrated his energy on a special department in which he has attained much reputation—viz. what is called New Testament grammar<sup>3</sup>—that he has had no time to spare for the department (not wholly unconnected by nature, but kept separate by the ruling tendency towards specialization) of Greek grammar. But it would seem that no weapon is too rusty to be used to destroy the reactionary critic who defends the authenticity of the writings attributed to Luke.

To illustrate the view taken on this subject by the archaeologists who study facts and have no critical or theological views to bolster up, I quote M. Bérard in the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, 1892, p. 237: he translates the expressions 'Ἀρτεῖμου τοῦ καὶ Ἀπολλωνεΐδου and 'Ἀπολλωνίδης ὁ καὶ Διαγόρας as 'Arteimas ou Apollonides,' 'Apollonides ou Diagoras'; and every archaeologist would justify him, or (I should rather say) would think it unnecessary to justify him.

There is, in the first place, nothing unusual in the use of *καὶ*, where in English we should naturally employ '*or*.' In a note on Aristophanes, *Eq.* 256, Mr. Neil in his

<sup>1</sup> See Boeckh on *C.I.G.* 2090, Reinach *Traité d'Épigr. Grecque*, p. 507, and my *Cit. and Bish.* i. pt. ii., p. 637 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *ἐπικαλούμενος*, and even *ὁ καλούμενος* simply, are also used; and *ἐπὶ τὴν* is also found frequently in Christian inscriptions to indicate the baptismal name, rarely in pagan names (*Cit. and Bish.* i., pt. ii., pp. 522, 539). The nickname or familiar name, Latin *signum*, approximates in character to the alternative name, without being exactly the same in nature.

<sup>3</sup> It is regrettable to see even Prof. Blass stooping to use this misleading title. We want two grammars in the New Testament: the first for the Greek of the Greek cities of Asia and Syria, with Luke and Paul, who use that Greek which they learned in childhood in such cities, the second for the foreigners of Syria and Palestine, who learned Greek as an alien tongue, and are continually influenced by Semitic modes of thought and grammar: these try to catch the Greek of the first class, but use it in a Semiticized style. But it is utterly misleading to quote St. John as proving the possibilities of Lukan grammar.

forthcoming edition speaks of this 'well-known idiom,' which occurs in that line, *καὶ δίκαια κᾶδικα*, and mentions the following analogous cases: Aesch. *Sept.* 414 f., *ib.* 1058, Eurip. *Supp.* 895, *Iph. Aul.* 643 (*ὅπως φῶ καὶ μὴ φῶ*), Plutarch *Quaest. Conv.* iv. 2, 655 c. (*ταῦτα ἔξεστι πιστεύειν καὶ μὴ*). In Thucydides the usage is common, e.g. ii. 35, 2, *εὖ τε καὶ χεῖρον εἰπὼντι*, 'whether he speak well or ill.' Dr. Postgate on Propertius v. 6, 51, says 'et, "or," like Greek καί,' Thucyd. ii. 42, 3 *πρώτῃ τε μηνύουσα καὶ τελευταία βεβαιούσα*, vi. 60, 1 *ἐπὶ ξυνωμοσίᾳ ὀλιγαρχικῇ καὶ τυραννικῇ*; and he writes to me: 'The denial of this and the corresponding usage of *que* in Latin (which is so common in Silver Latin poetry that it is impossible in many passages to decide whether *que* or *ne* should be read) comes from a curious pedantic inability to appreciate growth in language. Because καί primarily meant, and in general must be translated by 'and,' it is considered a point of fine scholarship to twist the translation of a passage until it can take 'and,' in oblivion of the fact that an English word is thereby fallaciously equated with a Greek one. I daresay you know a passage which well illustrates the growth of the idiom, though there καί does not indicate strict alternativeness, *χρονὸς ἑτέρῳ χρόνῳ παρατεθείς κρείττων τε καὶ δάπτων φαίνεται* (Dionys. *Ep. ad Pomp.* i. 7).' We may add that several examples of the desire to explain away this use of καί may be seen in Poppo's notes on the passages of Thucydides (in larger edition).

I have never noted the many examples of καί 'or' which have met my eye; but, besides Thucyd. ii. 35, 2, I recall Soph. *Ajax.* 476 *προσθείσα κἀναθείσα τοῦ γε κατθανεῖν* (where Wunder translates 'each day gives up to or rescues from death'), and Xen. *Anab.* ii. 1, 21 (*προιοῦσι δὲ καὶ ἀπιοῦσι πόλεμος*, 'but war, if we advance or retire'). Some geographical examples may also be quoted: Strab. p. 195 *τὸ φῶλον ὃ νῦν Γαλλικὸν τε καὶ Γαλατικὸν καλεῖται*, 'Gallic (according to the Roman) or Galatic (according to the Greek word)'; p. 788 (of the Nile-mouths) *τὸ μὲν Πηλουσιακὸν καλεῖται, τὸ δὲ Κανωβικὸν καὶ Ἡρακλεωτικόν*, 'another mouth is called Canopic or Herakleotic'; p. 802 *Χοῖς* is defined as *ὑπὲρ τοῦ Σεβεννυτικοῦ καὶ Φατνιτικοῦ στόματος* 'above the Sebennyitic-Phatnitic mouth' (in the upper part where these two branches are still joined and may bear either name): 'p. 670 *τοῦ Κιλικίου καὶ Παμφυλίου τρόπου*' the manner of Cilicia or Pamphylia: 'p. 97 *τὴν Σκυθικὴν καὶ Κελτικὴν*

the northern zone which may be called either Scythian or Celtic after the two chief races that inhabit its eastern and western parts.<sup>1</sup>

I pass now to some other usages, which perhaps afford a certain defence to the sense attributed to *ὁ Μίδα καὶ Φρύξ*.

(1) According to the strict Greek idea, a man could not belong as a citizen to more than one πόλις: his duty to his own πόλις absorbed him, and he must regard himself as bound to it against all other πόλεις. He must be a citizen of one πόλις or of another; but he could not be simultaneously a citizen of two cities. Hence the earlier, and the strictly correct usage is *ὁ δαῖνα Ἐφέσιος ὁ καὶ Ἀμόργιος*, *Ἐφέσιος ὁ καὶ Μειλήσιος*, *Νικομηδεὺς ὁ καὶ Τομύτης*, *Μειλήσιος ὁ καὶ Ἀμοργιεύς*, *Μεισήτης*,<sup>2</sup> denoting a person who in certain circumstances is a citizen of one city and in other circumstances of another city. These are alternative characters to the Greeks, though we now see no difficulty in calling a man a citizen of two or more cities; but the word 'city' is not an accurate rendering of πόλις; it is merely a vague approximation to a rendering, and we cannot really translate πόλις, because we have no πόλις now.

But, commonly, this cumbrous expression is not used: inscriptions generally speak of *ὁ δαῖνα Ἐφέσιος καὶ Σμυρναῖος*. The change in expression was, indeed, partly due to a change in feeling: under the Roman rule the old meaning and nature of πόλις was weakened, and its exclusiveness was forgotten, so that it did not seem so inconsistent to make a man citizen of two πόλεις. But, while this change in sense is admitted, may it not be that the change in expression is due in part to simplification, καί, like ὁ καί, implying alternativeness?

(2) Again, for chronological preciseness, we often find dates by two distinct eras; and the formula used is, in its fullest form, *ἔτους σξρ' τοῦ καὶ βπσ'*. But sometimes the article is omitted, *ἔτους σξρ' καὶ βπσ'*, or even both the article and καί, *ἔτους σξρ', βπσ'*.<sup>3</sup> This change is a fair parallel, for undoubtedly the reckoning by one era is an alternative rather than an addition to the reckoning by the other era.

<sup>1</sup> Such is, I think, the true sense of this passage; but some may prefer to understand 'the zone which contains both the Scythian and the Celtic race,' which is, of course, perfectly correct in construction, though not, so far as I can judge, the thought in Strabo's mind; he is not thinking here of the extent of the zone, but of different terms by which it might be denominated with equal justice.

<sup>2</sup> See examples quoted by S. Reinach, *Traité d'Épigr. Gr.* p. 507.

<sup>3</sup> For examples, see Kästner, *de aeris quae ab imp. Caes. initium duxerint*, p. 51 ff.

A typical example of this use of *καί* occurs in an inscription of the the Lydian Katakekaumene, Le Bas *Voyage* iii. No. 1674, and, as it has been misunderstood by M. Waddington,<sup>1</sup> a paragraph may be devoted to it. It was copied by Hamilton at Geulde (a village near the site of Satala Lydiae), and is dated *ἔτους η' καὶ π', μηνὸς Πανήμιου* ε'. The fifth day of Panemos in the year 80 of the Sullan era (which was ordinarily employed in the eastern parts of Lydia) was either 28 May (according to the general view) or 5 April (according to the view which I have suggested<sup>2</sup> as possible) in the year 5 B.C. On either view, the date falls in the eighteenth year of Augustus according to the official reckoning. It is evident, therefore, that the thought in the inscription is, 'in the year 18 (according to the Roman style) or 80 (according to the usual local era).'

(3) There is a well-known class of votive inscriptions in the Lydian Katakekaumene, dedicated to Men and Zeus, or other deities, such as Sabazios. It is clear that these are merely varying forms of the one great god; and it is pleasant to find that this is as emphatically stated in Dr. Buresch's *Aus Lydien*, as in what I have written on the subject. It would appear that the dedicators were quite aware that the various names which they use all belong to the one god. When we find a dedication *Μηνὶ Τυράνῳ καὶ Διὶ Ὀγμηνῶ καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ θεοῖς* (*Mous. Smyrn.* No. 785), it seems clear that this is equivalent to *Μηνὶ Τ. τῷ καὶ Διὶ Ο. καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ θεοῖς* (i.e. the *σύννομοι*, who make up the divine family). Moreover, the epithet *Τυράννος* is sometimes applied to Men, as in this case, sometimes to Zeus, as in Le Bas-Waddington iii. 667 *κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ Κοιρίου Τυράννου Διὸς Μασφαλαιηνοῦ* <αὐτῷ><sup>3</sup> καὶ Μηνὶ, i.e. 'according to the order of Zeus, a vow to Zeus and Men,' as M. Waddington explains. In these cases, then, as it would appear, *καί* indicates that the names are merely indications of different attitudes or envisagements of the one god.

It is possible, then, that *καί* may have

<sup>1</sup> M. Waddington conjecturally alters the text to read *η' καὶ π'*, a known but rare way of writing a date (not, however, so *bien insolite* as M. Waddington says in his note, see *Cit. and Bish. of Phryg.* Pt. II, p. 459); but there is no ground to change the text, for Hamilton's reading gives an excellent sense.

<sup>2</sup> *Cit. and Bish. of Phryg.*, pt. i., p. 204, supported by new evidence in an article soon to be published in the *Bull. de Corresp. Hellén.*

<sup>3</sup> The word has to be supplied in thought, in order to explain construction and sense; see Waddington's note.

been used occasionally in place of *ὁ καί* to indicate alternative names. This class of names was unfamiliar and strange in Greece proper, because in its origin and essence it belongs to the countries where Greek was used alongside of, and alternatively to another language. It is in the inscriptions of the Asiatic lands that the subject must be studied.

Here I may notice a remark of Prof. Blass bearing on the question of names in Asia Minor, in the *Philology of the Gospels* 1898, p. 220 f. Discussing the statement made in a Greek *catena*<sup>4</sup> that John dictated his gospel to his disciple Papias Eubiotos of Hierapolis, he says that 'it is impossible to take Eubiotos for a second name, or surname of Papias,' because 'a second name of Papias would also have the article, like *Δίων ὁ Κάσσιος* or *Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος*,' I do not maintain that the anonymous Greek author was right in what he says; but what he says must be estimated according to the usage of the inscriptions of Asia Minor. Before Prof. Blass made such a sweeping statement about the usage in names, he would have done well to look into the inscriptions, where he would find many examples to justify a double name Papias Eubiotos, expressed in Greek without intervening *καί*. Further, the rule is usual that 'Papias Eubiotos, son of Osais,' is expressed *Παπίας Ὁσαΐ Εὐβίος*: I need not quote examples of the universally admitted rule.<sup>5</sup> Whether the rule is an imitation of the Roman order, *nomen—praenomen—filiation—cognomen*, or springs from a native Anatolian custom, I am unable to say, and should be glad to learn of any evidence bearing on the point. The fact that in some inscriptions (e.g. *Inscr. Pergam.* ii. no. 485, Hula-Szanto *Bericht über eine Reise*, in *Wien. Sitzungsber.* 1894, p. 17 no. 11) both forms, with and without *ὁ καί*, occur side by side, seems to indicate some distinction in sense, as if the one indicated the strictly alternative name, the other the double name; yet such cases as *Ἑρμίας Ἐκατόμωος*, *Φανίας Κασίσιος*, *Τρύφων Κοράλλης*, *Ἀσκληπιᾶδης Πάρις*, show that even here the idea of alternative names in two languages is not very far removed.

The subject is a difficult one; and these notes are offered as professedly tentative. I should be glad to find that others would correct and complete what I have said. It is out of my province to study or collect

<sup>4</sup> Prof. Blass does not quote the words, nor give the reference, so that I cannot verify.

<sup>5</sup> Exception to rule, *Wien. Sitzungsber.* 1894, p. 8.



Greek grammatical facts; and it is a little hard that, in presenting the case in favour of a particular view, not popular in Germany, about early Christian history, I should have to contend for every elementary point in Asian geography and in Greek grammar that comes up in the course of the argument. Time after time, when I state some point generally accepted among those scholars who are not Theologians, I find that it is denied in the most positive and confident way by a Theologian who has committed himself to the opposite view in early Christian history, and who fights for his view with a resolution and energy worthy of the bravest regiment of British soldiers, which contests every inch of ground, regardless of every consideration except resistance. As to the extent of the well-known geographical name Galatia, I stated briefly the view as to its wide extent, which has been a commonplace to everyone who studies the history of Asia Minor for its own sake. A distinguished professor barely restrained himself in the pages of a great theological German journal from calling me a 'Humbag' because I asserted this elementary fact in a positive fashion without formally proving it.<sup>1</sup> Another presents a pistol at my head, and asks how I dare assume that *μενοῦν* can be used without a following *δέ*. A third heaps scorn on me for saying that the people of Galatia can be addressed as Galatians; and a fourth for saying that Παῦλος ὁ καὶ Σαῦλος means 'Paul *alias* Saul.' The 'North-Galatian Theory' and the theory of the late date and composite character of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles would be better defended, if the knowledge of history, geography, and language which their champions undoubtedly possess were applied to the task.

### III.—PHRYGO-GALATIAN SLAVES.

The name of the Phrygian slave in the *Wasps* suggests an interesting point. A large number of Galatian slaves are mentioned in the Delphic deeds of enfranchisement, more than from any country except Syria and Thrace.<sup>2</sup> These slaves belong

to the period B.C. 169–140, and it is remarkable that at this period such a large proportion of these enfranchised slaves should be Gauls. The question is, are they Gauls? or are they simply natives of Galatia belonging to that conquered class of Phrygians which formed the great mass of the population? I think a consideration of the circumstances will show that they are not Gauls by race, but Phrygians of Galatia.<sup>3</sup>

It is naturally improbable that Gauls, those proud and untamable barbarians, should be found during the early second century in such numbers as slaves, and slaves who behaved so peaceably and well as to work out their enfranchisement. In Wescher-Foucart 429 there occurs a certain Sosias, τὸ γένος Γαλάταν τεχνεῖται σκυτῆ. It is ridiculous to suppose that one of those Gauls, of whose lofty and noble spirit Plutarch and Polybius tell such striking anecdotes, settled down quietly as a shoemaker in slavery. The same remark applies to the skilled workwoman Athenais τεχνίτις in Baunack 2154.

We have only to look at the condition of Galatia. In a large and well-peopled country there was settled (either by force or, as Meyer thinks, by the action of the Pontic kings as lords of the land) a small conquering caste of Gauls, terrible from their strength, courage, and haughty untamable spirit, but not from their numbers. The first great army that entered Asia Minor numbered only 20,000, of whom only half were fighting men; and there is no reason to think that any great additions were made to their numbers by greater armies, while constant war must have prevented any important internal increase between 278 and 200. There can be no doubt that, as Van Gelder<sup>3</sup> says, they merely followed the usual principle (Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* i. 31), taking possession of one-third of the land, and leaving two-thirds to the original Phrygian population. It is also clear that some at least of the great cities retained their independence for a considerable time. Pessinus was not

donians, 5 Sarmatians, 4 Illyrians, 4 Cappadocians, 4 Armenians (besides a slave Ἀμύνιος, whose nationality, though not stated, can be gathered from his name, Strabo, p. 304), and so on. The numbers are reckoned by Staehelin, *Gesch. des kleinasi. Galater*, p. 57. Most of the inscriptions were published by MM. Wescher and Foucart, *Inscr. rec. à Delphes*: all are given by Baunack in Collitz's *Sammlung der Gr. Dialektinschr.* ii, pts. 3–5.

<sup>3</sup> *De Gallis in Asia*, p. 183. He does not, however, mention the division in parts, but says that they reduced the older population entirely to the condition of *coloni*.

<sup>1</sup> He has since then fully admitted that my use of the term was justifiable; and that is now apparently universally admitted in Germany, though some of the English champions of the North Galatian theory still decline to acknowledge that they were wrong in restricting the name Galatia, e.g. Dr. Cheetham in *Classical Review* 1894, p. 396.

<sup>2</sup> 33 Syrians, 28 Thracians, 10 Galatians, 8 Mace-

under the Gauls in B.C. 190, but had come under their power before 164, probably by an agreement according to which one-half of the priestly college was to be Gaulish and one-half of the old Phrygian priestly families.<sup>1</sup> Gordium, still a great commercial city in 190 (as in 334), was apparently conquered and destroyed by the Gauls soon after. In no other way can its utter disappearance from history, and the want of any remains other than very ancient on its site be explained.

From Galatia there came numerous slaves, and the Greeks called all slaves from Galatia Galatians; but the occupation and the good conduct of these slaves mark them as belonging, not to the Gaulish aristocracy of Galatia, but to the conquered Phrygian population. Next, look at the names. Among them we find the name Maiphates. This is obviously not a Celtic name. Equally certainly, it is a Phrygian name, found in a Phrygian inscription (which will be published soon by Mr. J. G. C. Anderson),<sup>2</sup> and belonging to a class of characteristic Anatolian type, like Maibouzanēs, Maidatas (B.C.H. v. 226, vii. 130), and Maiandros (possibly we may add the Armenian Maipheracta Martyropolis). Comparing Maidatas, Maibouzanēs with Mithradatas, Mithrabouzanēs, we see that Mai involves a divine name—evidently Ma, the Great Goddess of Anatolia, the Mother. She is the Earth the Mother, associated with the Sky the Father. Now the Lydian word for Earth is *Mōū* (Hesych.); and the Ionic dialect which was seated on the Lydian coastlands uses *ων* for the ordinary *ω*; hence we see that *Mōū* is equivalent to *Ma-ū* (in Greek legend *Maia*), as in *Μαύσσωλλος* (compare the numerous family of Carian and Lydian names with suffix *-σσωλλος*, e.g. *Παραύσσωλλος*). Further, comparing *Μαϊανδρος* with *Σκάμανδρος*, we see two compounds with two words meaning 'Earth,' Ma and Skam (*χθών, χάμαι*, ksham): what the second element in these river-names may be, I do not venture to hold any opinion ('the man of the Earth, i.e. who rises out of the Earth' seems an idea too purely Greek).

Maiphates, then, belongs to a purely Anatolian class of names, which has no analogy in Celtic (see Holder's *altcelt. Sprachschatz*), though as might be expected,

<sup>1</sup> See Körte, *Athen. Mittheil.* 1897, pp. 16, 39: in *Woch. f. Klass. Philol.*, 1898, p. 3 he accepts my suggestion as to the division of the priesthood.

<sup>2</sup> See *Journ. Hell. Stud.* 1898, p. 123, where *Μαίφάτει* may be either gen. or fem. dative. But *Μαικιανή*, which is there quoted, is the Latin Maeciana.

it has analogy in the Thracian *Μηφάζουλα*: the class is Phrygo-Thracian.

Now Strabo p. 304 points out that among the Greeks slave-names were either *personal names* characteristic of their nation as *Μίδας*, *Μάρης*, or actually their race-name, as *Αυδός*, *Σύρος*; hence we infer that Maiphates was a Phrygian slave by race. It is true that the master gave the name to his slave; but it is clear that in some cases the name which had been given by the slave's parents was allowed to remain. For example, when we find a Jewish slave Antigona with two daughters Theodora and Dorothea (Wescher-Foucart 57), we can hardly doubt that these names, so characteristic of Jewish habits, and obviously translations of Hebrew names,<sup>3</sup> were given by the parents and permitted by the purchaser to continue. Three Phrygian slaves (i.e. slaves from Phrygia Asiana) are mentioned in the Delphic deeds. They are called Menophilos, Diodorus Diodora (Wescher-Foucart 45, 257, Baunack 2289): these are so characteristic of Phrygian religion that they are either the original names or are given by the purchaser<sup>4</sup> from knowledge of Phrygian religion.

Among Syrian slaves we find the names Kossypha, Manthane, Enome, Libanos, Zois,<sup>5</sup> (W. F. 426, B. 2175, 2183, 2184), which are probably pure Syrian; Ladika, Asia, which are selected apparently as suitable to Asiaties from the Seleucid realm; Eirana, (i.e. Salome), Boethos (Oser, Ezra), Eutychos (Naamon), Elaphion (Tabitha), Agatho, Theodosios, &c., which are probably translation of Semitic names (see Herzog, *l.c.*); Aphrodisia (twice), Sarapion, &c. which are connected with deities reckoned characteristic of the East.<sup>6</sup>

There is therefore every probability that, among ten slaves, some would bear the names characteristic of their race; and among these slaves from Galatia the names Maiphates, and Artemon are characteristic of Phrygian language and religion, while Athenais is probably a translation of a Phrygian name.<sup>7</sup> Had there been Gaulish slaves,

<sup>3</sup> See Herzog in *Philologus* lvi., p. 50 ff.

<sup>4</sup> The slaves were bought from abroad: if born in Greece they were called *ἐνδογενής* or *οἰκογενής*.

<sup>5</sup> Enome, perhaps a grecized form of Naomi, Libanos of Laban, or the mountain-name.

<sup>6</sup> Similarly we find in the Delphic lists Menophilos and Mithradates Cappadocian slaves, Ioudaios Jewish, Bithys Thracian, Ana and Ammia Illyrian, and so on.

<sup>7</sup> Compare Athenais ἡ καὶ Βαζίς in Cappadocia (*Journ. of Philol.* xi., 1882, p. 148); Baziς means 'belonging to the God' (bagha), see *Cit. and Bish. of Phr.* i. p. 153.

we should certainly have expected some indication of the fact.

When the masters gave a name purely of their own choice, they selected as a rule one of good omen: hence there is a vast number of names connected with *σώζω*, Soso, Sotion, Sosikles, Sosias, Sosicka, Sosikrates, Sosis, Soteris, Soteles, Soteridas, Sosila, Soto, Soterichos, Sokrita, Sokratis, Sopolis, Agathon, Eutychos, &c. Yet, even of these, some are probably the translation of Semitic names, as Herzog recognises in the case of Boëthos, Eirene, Eutychos &c. Now at Delphi among the Galatian slaves we find Sosias,<sup>1</sup> Sosos, Sosandros, Agathon, and twice Eutychos; some of these may be merely for good luck; but it seems not improbable that Sosias was partly suggested by connexion with Phrygian worship: the name sounded fortunate in Greek, and had at the same time a suitability to a person from the land of the god Sozon.

We are forced, therefore, to the conclusion that early in the second century B.C., the word *Γαλάτης* was used among the Greeks simply in the sense of 'sprung from the country called Galatia,' without implying Gaulish blood. Further, this bears on the point, which I have elsewhere urged, that no term *Ituraea* is ever used by the ancients. The *Ituraei* were a tribe pure and simply, or perhaps a set of tribes, and certainly nomads: they had no settled territorial organisation, and therefore did not constitute a country, so that the noun *Ituraea* never came into existence. But Galatia was a country with a definite organisation; and when the political term once establishes itself for the country, then the ethnic comes to be used in the sense of 'belonging to the

country.' Yet distinguished 'North-Galatian' scholars assert that, as late as A.D. 50, the term *Γαλάται* could not be applied to any one who was not of Gallic blood, oblivious of the fact that, when Churches began to exist in the cities of North Galatia, they would probably to a large extent consist of persons who had not a drop of Gallic blood in their veins.

In such a passage as Pausanias vii. 17, 10, *Γαλατῶν οἱ Πέσσινοι ἔχοντες, ὧν οὐχ ἀπτόμενοι*, it is clear that *Γαλάται* is not restricted to persons of Gallic blood. Pausanias means to say that the population of Pessinus refrained from touching the flesh of the pig. As we have seen above, the Gallic element was weaker probably in Pessinus than in the other great Galatian cities Ancyra and Tavium; and there existed there even aristocratic Phrygian priestly families, while in other parts of North Galatia the aristocracy was Gallic, and the trading and working classes were Phrygian. The whole cycle of legend in which this passage of Pausanias moves is Phrygian, and he obviously uses the name 'Galatian' without any thought of birth, simply to denote the inhabitants of Galatia.

The Galatian slave-traders seem to have been specially distinguished in their own line, to judge from Ammianus xxii. 7, 8 (who speaks of them as specially concerned even with Gothic slaves). Considering the permanence of trades in Asia Minor, which is so remarkable a feature in the country, it is probable that the number of Galatian slaves in Greece in the second century B.C. is due to the fact that even then the merchants of Galatia (Phrygians or Greeks by race, doubtless) had a prominent place in the slave market.

W. M. RAMSAY.

#### ARCHAEOLOGICAL NOTES ON BACCHYLIDES.

As every Greek poet of the first rank, of whose works we have any considerable remains, has contributed something to our knowledge of Greek religious forms or religious thought, every scholar interested in Greek religion, immediately on the discovery of the new Bacchylides, would be naturally eager to learn what we can gather from him in this field. The result is somewhat disappointing, in spite of his bright and occasionally original treatment of certain

myths. As regards religious poetry proper, the sphere in which his contemporaries, Pindar, Aeschylus and Sophocles, achieved much, we can quote nothing of first importance from Bacchylides. He moralises like the others on the divine government of the world, but his words do not strike home; he speaks without profound or original conviction and without the glow of inspiration. He follows the tendency of his age in the personification of abstract ideas,

<sup>1</sup> The race to which the slaves named Sosias at Delphi belonged is not recorded in any other case, except this Galatian.

and he says some graceful words about some of them such as *Ειρήνη*; but moral forces are not living powers for him as for Aeschylus. His poetry teems with epithets of divinities, some of which have the merit of novelty; for instance, *Νίκη κvanoπλόκαμος*, *σεμνοδότεια φήμη*, *Ζεὺς βαθυπλόκαμος*, *κεραυνεγχής*, *μεγιστοπάτωρ*, *εὐκλειος*, *Ἥρα μεγιστοάνασσα*, *Ἀθηνᾶ χρύσαιγς*, *χρυσάρματος*, *πολέμαιγς*, *Διόνυσος ὀρσιβάκχης*, *Ποσειδῶν ὀρσίαιλος*, *δαμασίχθων ἀναξίαλος*, *Ἄρτεμις ἀριστοπάτρα*, *λευκώλενος*, *Ἀφροδίτη θελέμβροτος*, which will all go to enrich the new edition of Bruchmann's 'Epitheta Deorum.' The enquiry into the multitudinous epithets of divinities is important, because much religious thought or ritualistic observance is expressed or is latent in them. The Greek worshipper was careful in this matter; so also as a rule were the Greek poets. Few epithets are fixtures; most are chosen with a strict sense of relevance. Bacchylides on the contrary is here most lax and vague; he selects his epithets mainly for picturesque or decorative effect or for the purposes of metre, or to assist him in introducing an irrelevant story. And his accumulation of divine adjectives is frequently wearisome. The following notes may perhaps seem to justify these strictures.

Bacchylides ii. 1:—*Ἀ[ἴ]ζον, ὧ σ]εμνοδότεια φήμη*. Kenyon compares *αἰνοδότεια*—*Ἐρινύες αἰνοδότεια*, Orph. *Argon.* 354: *βαρυνδότεια*, Aesch. *Sept.* 975. The emendation seems inevitable, but the meaning K. suggests 'giver of glory' is open to doubt. *τὸ σεμνόν* is not an obvious expression for glory, and *σεμνοδότεια* ought to be translated 'august giver'; for where the first part of a compound is an adjective, the normal meaning of the compound is the same as that of the adjective and noun uncompounded, e.g. *καλλίπαις*, *καλλίπολις*, *προβουλόπαις*, *αἰνόπαρις*, *αἰνολέων*. The other two compounds of *δότεια* that K. quotes may be translated in accordance with this rule—*αἰνοδότεια* fell awarder, *βαρυνδότεια* heavy awarder; so also *ὀρθοδότεια*, which he does not quote, in Orph. *Hymn* 76, 5 (*Μοῦσαι*) *διανοίας ὀρθοδότεια*. (*Ὀλβοδότεια* which he quotes from Euripides—an epithet of *Εἰρήνη*—is obviously of different formation, cf. *Πλουτοδότεια Carm. adesp.* Bergk iii. p. 703.). The new-coined *σεμνοδότεια* is either laxly employed or is vague in its significance. The personification of *φήμη*, of which this is the first example in literature, is in accordance with a general tendency of contemporary poetry to present such abstractions in personal form. The scholiast on Aeschines

in *Timarch.* (Dindorf, p. 33) tells us that the Athenians erected an altar to *φήμη* in consequence of the miraculous rumour that reached them of Cimon's victory; assuming the statement to be historical, we are still uncertain whether the poem of Bacchylides was earlier or later than the erection of the altar.

iii. 2. *ἰοστέφανόν τε Κούραν*: the absence of the article suggests that *Κόρη* is a proper name, being probably used in this way as early as 500 B.C.; the epithet is merely decorative, the violet-crown being no special attribute of Kora.

v. 33. *κvanoπλόκαμον θ' ἕκατι Νίκας*—a new-coined and irrelevant epithet, rather less natural than the *καλλίσφυρος* of Hesiod's Nike, *Theog.* 384. All the other epithets applied by the poets to this goddess are expressive, even his own *γλυκύδαρος*, xi. 1.

v. 99. *καλικοστέφανον σεμνᾶς Ἀρτέμιδος λευκωλένου*: the accumulation of epithet is characteristic of his profuse decorative style: the first is a *παρὰ λεγόμενον*, the second never elsewhere attached to Artemis; neither has any significance for the context.

v. 102. *αἰγῶν θυσίαισι καὶ βοῶν φοινικονότων*: the goat is the sacrificial animal especially appropriate to Artemis: the ox was rarely offered, but was proper to this occasion, for Oeneus had offended by neglecting Artemis in the *Θαλύσια*, the agricultural sacrifice. But it is doubtful, whether B. is writing with any careful attention to ritual.

v. 123. *ἀγροτέρα Λατοῦς θυγάτηρ*: for once the epithet is appropriate, the legend referring to the goddess of the wild; but *Λαφρία* would be the title more strictly in accordance with local cult.

v. 175. *Κύπριδος θελέμβροτον*, cf. Orph. *Λίθ.* 315: epithet of Aphrodite not found elsewhere.

v. 199. *ὁ μεγιστοπάτωρ Ζεὺς*—unique epithet: for the formation of the word, cf. 19, 21 *μεγιστοάνασσα* (*Ἥρα*) and Orph. *Hymn* 15 (2), *τὸ αὐτοπάτωρ*.

vii. 1. This passage and a fragment of Pindar (Plutarch 1007 b *ἀνακτα τῶν πάντων ὑπερβάλλοντα χρόνον μακάρων*), are the earliest personifications of *χρόνος* in literature. *Χρόνος* is here treated after the manner of Hesiod as an elemental power with a progeny. The personification appears in Sophocles and was frequent enough in Euripides to attract the sarcasm of Aristophanes. The phrase in Bacchylides is somewhat of a poetical conundrum, for no ordinary Greek would know who was the daughter of Night and of Time.



viii. 10. Ζεῦ κεραννεγγές, unique epithet.

xi. 1-9. A new genealogy is here given to Nike. While in the epigram attributed to Bacchylides (Bergk 48) he follows the Hesiodic tradition and calls her the daughter of Pallas the giant, he here affiliates her to Zeus. The latter genealogy appears only in much later literature (Himerius *Or.* xix. 3), unless the epithet εἰπάτεια (Menander *Incert.* 218) may be supposed to allude to it. We may account for it through the close affinity between Nike and Athena. 9. βαθυπλόκαμον κοῖρα Διὸς ὀρθοδίκου. If both these epithets, which seem to be rightly restored, belong to Zeus, the incongruity in their juxtaposition may remind us of a verse in a Vedic hymn. But is Bacchylides capable of calling Zeus in a single breath 'god of long tresses' and 'of upright justice'? Perhaps. The epithet βαθυπλόκαμος is certainly out of harmony with the representation of contemporary art; but a poet need not follow the lead of the contemporary artist. Bacchylides might be content to follow Homer. Jebb's emendation βαθυπλόκαμ' Ω is intended to save the poet's character as touching the choice of epithets; but Bacchylides, although the sign Ω for long O does not occur in the few inscriptions of Ceos that belong to the fifth century, would probably use Ionic letters, and the two forms would not be liable to confusion.

37-39. νῦν δ' Ἀρτεμὶς ἄγροτέρα χρυσαλάκατος λιπαρὰν [ἡμέ]ρα τοξόκλυτος νίκαν ἔδωκεν. The restoration ἡμέρα must be right, for out of the multitude of Artemis epithets none other would suit the metre or the subtle purpose of Bacchylides. But the editor remarks that ἡμέρα is a title specially appropriate here. It would be truer to say that a more inappropriate title could not have been chosen. No passage betrays more glaringly the carelessness of Bacchylides in his selection of the appropriate adjective. So far he has been dutifully pursuing his proper theme, which was the celebration of the Pythian victory of the boy-wrestler of Metapontum. There was no reason why he should bring Artemis into the poem at all, who had no connection with the Pythian or any other national festival. It may be that she was a prominent goddess of Metapontum, as we gather from Bacchylides but from no other author. It may be that he was aware that in many parts of Greece boys were specially put under the protection of Artemis, who as φιλομήραξ presided over the boys' gymnasium in Elis. But, granting this, we cannot by reference to any fact or the suggestion of any hypothesis justify the grotesque ac-

cumulation of epithets which cloud his picture of the goddess. Τοξόκλυτος of course may pass, so may χρυσαλάκατος, an appellative which few divine females in Greek poetry could escape. These two would suffice, but Bacchylides like the composers of the later Orphic hymns, demanded more, and he chooses the two most irrelevant to his legitimate purpose, and most incongruous in themselves, ἄγροτέρα and ἡμέρα. As ἄγροτέρα, Artemis should be slaying wild beasts and devouring goats and boars, not presiding at the games, and so far as she was ἄγροτέρα she was decidedly not ἡμέρα. As ἡμέρα she should be releasing someone from madness; and we dare not suppose that the boy-wrestler or that Bacchylides had recently been suffering. But Bacchylides is moved by a real motive other than the mere exigencies of metre; he wishes at this point to find a stepping-stone to the story of the Proetides: in this story Artemis ἡμερασία or ἡμέρα was prominent (see my *Cults of the Greek States*, vol. ii. Artemis R. 38); therefore he artfully suggests that it was Artemis ἡμέρα who gave the victory in the wrestling-match. He now feels justified in telling us another story about Artemis ἡμέρα, how she healed the daughters of Proetus and was therefore worshipped at Lousoi in Arcadia under that title. Having achieved this remarkable leap from the Pythian games to the Arcadian city, he found it a light matter to bring in by the way the story of the foundation of Tiryns. Then having followed Proetus as far as Lousoi in Arcadia he naturally wants to return to Metapontum. The clue for the return journey is given thus: (113): Artemis was so pleased with the Arcadian temple which Proetus and the Argives erected that she was willing to follow the Achaeans all over the world; therefore she dwells at Metapontum (which was built either by the Achaeans of North Peloponnese or by the Pylians according to Strabo p. 264, not by Proetus or the Argives). And someone's ancestors (possibly the ancestors of Alexidamos, scarcely of Bacchylides himself, see *Revue des Études grecques* 1898 p. 25-26) built a shrine to Artemis on the river near Metapontum. The editor finds in Artemis a thread of connection in this labyrinth; but the thread is not discoverable by modern ingenuity. We must either suppose that Bacchylides is the most rambling and incoherent of poets; or we must defend him by the following hypotheses: there was a worship of Artemis ἡμέρα at Metapontum, which was affiliated

to that at Lousoi in Arcadia: this latter shrine which Proetus built was a centre of Achaean worship and a starting-point for Achaean colonisation, or at least for the colonisation of Metapontum; therefore a citizen of Metapontum would be under the protection of Artemis Ἡμέρα. These hypotheses have no shadow of probability about them; even if based on fact, they would only excuse Bacchylides to some extent; for no poet who had any sense for the real significance of divine epithets could have written lines 37-39. The goddess who here is content with the modest style of these four epithets is allowed two more in 106-107, Ἀριστόπατρα and Θηροσκόπος, and in these last lines her name is omitted altogether, for Bacchylides, like Lycophron, is fond of omitting the proper name and substituting vague appellatives for it (cf. 16, 19 and 18, 30).

But to the spirit of irrelevance we owe many interesting stories: and we have in this ode a detailed account of the myth of the daughters of Proetus who mock at Hera and give themselves over to orgiastic revels on the mountains and are finally cured by Artemis. The legend appears to have been already noticed by Hesiod (Apollod. 2. 2. 2); and Pherecydes handled it in much the same way as Bacchylides (Schol. Hom. *Od.* 15, 225). I have pointed out the possible anthropological significance of this story, in which the cult of Artemis is associated with a rebellion of the women of the tribe against the married state (*Cults of the Greek States*, vol. ii. p. 448). Bacchylides adds little to our knowledge of a very curious legend: and he does not allude to Teiresias and the dance of the young men.

xiii. 25. βωμὸν ἀριστάρχου Διός. An interesting epithet of Zeus, derived very possibly from actual cult, cf. Simonid. Frag. 231. The only clear cult-record appears to associate the word with Artemis.

xviii. 22. Κρονίδα Ἀνταίου σεισίχθονος τέκος. Does Ἀνταῖος signify the god 'who loosens the land' or the god of Lutai in Thessaly? Steph. Byz. s. v. *Ανταί* and Hesych. s. v. *Ανταίη*: see Kenyon's note. It is natural that Sinis, like other violent characters, should be the son of Poseidon, but we hear nothing elsewhere of Poseidon Ἀνταῖος or of any connection between Sinis and Thessaly.

Frag. 1, 7. Διὸς εὐκλείου δὲ ἑκατι. Minos is said to have won the maiden Dexithea in the name of Zeus εὐκλείος. This epithet of Zeus, hitherto unknown, can

scarcely have been invented at random. It may have alluded to the glory of the offspring that was to come from this union, though Greek mythology seems to know nothing of Euxantios. We may rather perhaps believe that the title was suggested by the cult of Artemis εὐκλεία, the name as applied to Artemis possibly alluding to the honourable estate of matrimony, a meaning appropriate to the passage in Bacchylides.

These disconnected notes may close with a suggestion about the Croesus-story which has naturally attracted attention since the new version given by Bacchylides. He believes that the king placed himself on the pyre, was saved by Zeus, and translated by Apollo to the land of the Hyperboreans. The poet was perhaps not alone in this belief, as the representation on the vase in the Louvre (*Mon. d. Inst.* pl. liv.) may show. Apart from Bacchylides, there were other writers who treated the Croesus story differently from Herodotus: Ctesias (Frag. 29, Müller) seems ignorant of the pyre episode; he recounts how Croesus was again and again put in bonds by Cyrus and always miraculously released and at last forgiven by the Persian king and treated with reverence as a holy man. Later writers also, like Castor, ignore the burning, while others such as Plutarch, Diodorus, Ptolemaeus, Hephaestion, and Ausonius, follow Herodotus. What is singular is that both Herodotus and Ctesias are aware that Croesus survived the capture of Sardis and became the trusted friend of the Persian monarch. We can scarcely believe then that there is any historical basis for the appearance of Croesus on the pyre. The Persians might have put him there or he might have placed himself there; but in that case we should probably have heard nothing more of his subsequent career. Bacchylides transplants the story into fairy-land. May not the pyre-episode be simply part of an Oriental and European myth of the self-immolation of a divine personage on the pyre, the story told of Sardanapalus, Heracles and Dido, and at last, singularly enough, attaching itself to the half-heroic figure of the last Lydian king? Mr. Frazer knows of certain gods of the people who were burned.<sup>1</sup> I would not venture to say that Croesus was afterwards regarded in this light: but the story probably belongs more to religious myth than to secular history.

L. R. FARNELL.

<sup>1</sup> *Golden Bough*, vol. ii. p. 275.

ON THE WORD *παρεξείρεσις* AND ON GREEK SUBSTANTIVES COMPOUNDED WITH PREPOSITIONS.

THE word *παρεξείρεσις* is usually explained to mean that part of a ship's upper-works which is either forward or abaft of the rowers' benches, the ship's bows or quarters. This is the explanation given by Suidas, by Stephanus, and all later lexicographers, by the Scholiast and all later commentators on Thucydides, by Dr. Warre in Smith's *Dict. Antiq.* and by Mr. Cecil Torr in *Ancient Ships*. Hesychius gives the same meaning, but with the important difference that he calls the word *παρεξείρεσιον*, not *παρεξείρεσις*.

Dr. Assmann in Baumeister's *Denkmäler* gives a different meaning. He translates the word 'Riemenkasten' and explains it to mean a projecting part of the ship's sides, built out in order to give room for the longest and most effective bank of oars. He compares its form to the closed keyboard of the ordinary cottage piano. The meaning given by Dr. Assmann agrees perfectly with all the passages in which the word is found, and there are two at least which, so far as I can see, will admit of no other meaning. These are (1) Thucyd. vii. 34, 5, and (2) Arrian, *Peripl. Pont. Eux.* p. 4. In the former passage Thucydides says that the carrying away of the *παρεξείρεσις* made the ships *ἄπλοιοι*, that is, crippled, unable to move, unmanageable; and this must of necessity mean that the rowing power was destroyed. A ship would certainly not be rendered *ἄπλοος* by having either the forward or after part of its upper-works carried away, so long as the oarsmen's part of the ship's sides remained safe.

Arrian, in the passage mentioned above, says that on one occasion the sea ran so high that not only did the water come through the port-holes, but the seas broke right over the ship's sides—*μη̄ κατὰ τὰς κώπας μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ τὰς παρεξείρεσις ἐπεωρεῖν ἡμῖν ἑκατέρωθεν ἀφθόνως τοῦ ὕδατος*. It is evident that in this sentence the expression *ὑπὲρ τὰς παρεξείρεσις* means something higher than the port-holes, not forward or abaft of them. (I am not able to refer to Agathias, but if he is correctly quoted in Stephanus he implies clearly that the *παρεξείρεσις* was the part of the ship used by the oarsmen.)

But even Dr. Assmann accepts the ordinary account of the origin of the word,

and supposes it to mean literally the part of the ship which is outside the rowers' benches; and it does not seem to have struck him that there is anything extraordinary in supposing that *παρεξείρεσις* is equivalent, as Suidas says, to *τὸ παρὲς τῆς εἰρεσίας*. And yet such a compound is almost unparalleled in classical Greek. It is true that the form *παρεξείρεσιον*, given by Hesychius, might and probably would have that meaning, but *παρεξείρεσις*, whatever it might mean at the date of Suidas, in the time of Thucydides could only mean the 'outside rowing place' or the 'outside crew.'

No rule on this subject has been given, so far as I am aware, by any writer on Greek grammar, and it seems desirable that it should be stated. It is this: (1) When a preposition is prefixed to a substantive so as to form a compound substantive, the form of the substantive itself remaining unchanged, the preposition must take an adjectival force. (2) On the other hand, when a preposition is combined with its case to form a new compound substantive, the compound takes a new termination, and this termination is usually either a neuter adjective form in *-ον* or *-ιον* (sometimes *-αιον* or *-ειον*) or else a feminine in *-ίς*. Other terminations are rare, and when they occur they are probably to be considered not as original compounds, but as derivatives from compound adjectives or compound verbs, e.g. *παράνοια*, *ἐκδημία*, *ἐμμετρία*.

Illustrations of rule (1) are so numerous that it is scarcely necessary to mention any of them. Take for instance the various compounds formed by prefixing prepositions to *ὁδός*, *ἔδρα*, *πλόος*. In all of them the preposition has an adjectival force.

Exceptions to these rules are both rare and late. For instance, the word *ἀντιστράτηγος* in Thucydides means an opposing general, but in Polybius, *ἀντιστράτηγος* and *ἀνθύπατος* are used as translations of the Latin *propraetor* and *proconsul*. Again the classical word for a pillow is *προσκεφάλαιον*, but in the Septuagint it is *προσκεφάλῃ*.

The rules given above apply of course only to the formation of compound substantives. The case is quite different with adjectives. In them, in the majority of cases, the preposition retains its prepositional force; e.g. *ἀντίθεος*, *παράνομος*, *παρά*

λογος, ἔκτοπος, προσήλιος, ὑπόσπονδος. And in some cases adjectives formed in this way seem to be used as substantives. This may be the explanation of the words Προκύν and Πρότῃθυσ, ἀστήρ being used with the former and γραῖα with the latter; but I should be more inclined to treat these proper names as exceptions to the general rule. Cicero at any rate seems to take Προκύν as a substantive, and translates it Antecanis, which is as great a rarity in Latin as Προκύν and Πρότῃθυσ, if they are to be considered substantives, are in Greek. With regard to ἀντιστράτηγος and ἀνθύπατος and their Latin originals propraetor and proconsul, there can be little doubt that these titles were originally pro praetore and pro consule, but that almost immediately the necessity for case inflexions of these titles would be felt, and it would be inevitable that they should be turned into compounds which could be declined throughout. They stand on the same footing as the proper names mentioned above.

I have given παράλογος as an instance of an adjective normally formed from παρά λόγον, but there is also a substantive παράλογος, and it is possible that this word also may in some cases be an exception to rule (1), and may be equivalent to τὸ παρά λόγον. But this is not at all necessary. It is more probable that the word always means, what it certainly means sometimes, not a surprise but a miscalculation. The word πρόδομος again might be understood in two ways, but the existence of the synonym προδωμάτων and the fact that πρόδομος is sometimes followed by the genitive δόμον both seem to imply that the preposition is used normally with an adjectival force as in the English 'ante-room.'

It is much to be regretted that neither Lobeck nor Donaldson, the two grammarians who might have been expected to deal with this subject, have given us any definite rules about it. Some materials may be found in Lobeck's writings, especially in the *Parerga*, Cap. I., and in the *Paralipomena*, Diss. 5. There is nothing to help us, so far as I have been able to discover, in Buttmann's larger grammar.

I should like to take this opportunity of calling the attention of Latin scholars, before it is too late, to a class of abnormal compounds which have been introduced into the English language during the last fifty years. The compilation of the great Oxford Dictionary seems to offer an opportunity, such as may never occur again, for removing these anomalies. I allude to the numerous adjectives like pre-historic, pre-Socratic, etc., which have been introduced into the language, I know not by whom, in defiance of grammar, and without any excuse on the ground of necessity or even convenience. Antelucanus and antemeridianus are normally formed from ante lucem and ante meridiem, and furnished examples which were followed by English writers down to the end of the first half of the present century. Why we should say prediluvian instead of antediluvian, or prehistoric instead of antehistoric, is a question which I leave to be answered by those who use these words. So far as my recollection goes, the first of these monstrosities was the word Pre-Raphaelite. I should be glad if the *Classical Review* would use its authority to check this growing mischief.

G. S. SALE.

Dunedin, New Zealand.

#### CLYTEMNESTRA'S WEAPON.

A DIFFICULTY, well known but not yet solved, is presented by the different allusions in the *Agamemnon* and *Choephori* to the weapon or weapons employed by Clytemnestra in the murder of the King and Cassandra. The familiar idea that he was slain with an axe is not derived, directly at least, from Aeschylus but from his successors. In collating the Aeschylean references we have to distinguish (a) those which more or less distinctly indicate a sword from (b) those which cannot be understood in that sense. The

former are three: (1) *Agam.* 1262, Cassandra prophetically describes the queen as whetting a sword (φάσανον) for her husband. On the other hand, where she refers in the same context to her own impending death, it is not in connection with the sword. The employment of two different weapons is thus, perhaps, implied. (2) *Agam.* 1528, the Elders, immediately after the deed and while the two bodies are displayed, speak of the murder of Agamemnon as a 'death by the sword' (ἐξιφοδύλῃτος θάνατος). (3) *Choeph.*



1009, *φῶρος τόδ' ὥς ἔβαψεν Αἰγίσθου ἔϊφος*. From this it must undoubtedly be concluded that Clytemnestra borrowed and used the sword of Aegisthus. It is likely also that Aegisthus himself refers to this when he boasts of having had a hand in the murder, though he was at a distance (*Agam.* 1608). If it is argued that in the first two passages the 'sword' need not represent that particular weapon but merely a bloody death, it may fairly be answered that the third allusion is so definite as to give some evidential value to the others. The sword, therefore, must first of all be assumed.

But there are two references to a different weapon, viz. *Agam.* 1520 *ἀμφιτόμον βέλεμον* and *ibid.* 1149 *ἀμφίκει δορί*. The epithets here are, no doubt, applicable to a 'two-edged' sword, but the nouns are not. Though the 'sword' may stand for any deadly weapon, it cannot be maintained conversely that a sword can be indicated by terms properly denoting a spear or an axe. As to the first, indeed, there is some slight ground for doubt, because in another passage, *Choeph.* 164, as the text stands, we must assign the meaning 'sword' to the cognate word *βέλος*: *σχέδια τ' αὐτόκωπα νομῶν βέλη*, that is, as Butler translates, 'quae in pugna stataria adhibentur, cum ad digladiationem ventum est, enses scil. quibus manubrium est.' But, as the word is used just before in the same sentence with the meaning 'arrows,' we may well dismiss it with Pauw as a slip of the copyist for *ἔϊφος*; and even if it is allowed, the meaning 'sword' really resides in the epithets *σχέδια* and *αὐτόκωπα*, which serve precisely to exclude the ordinary sense of *βέλος*. In the other passage, however, it is quite impossible to take *δόρυ* for a sword. The word means primarily a wooden shaft and by extension a weapon with such a shaft; but a sword cannot be so described, nor is the term anywhere open to that interpretation. Hence, unless Aeschylus wrote very vaguely here as well as in the prophecy of Cassandra just quoted, it results that a second weapon was used.

So far as the bulk of the evidence goes, that weapon might be either a spear or an axe. 'Spear' is the first obvious interpretation of *ἀμφιτομον δόρυ* and of *βέλεμον*, which does not really differ from *βέλος*, though in the singular it is somewhat more individual. The phrase *ἐκ χειρός* with *βέλεμον* (l. 1520) is appropriate enough either to the throwing of a spear or to the wielding of an axe. But in favour of the axe there are two, if not more, strong arguments. First, the word *ἄχισμός* (*ἀμφίκει δορί*) in Cassandra's

prediction of her own death decidedly points to that weapon, suggesting the downward blow cleaving the head, and still more the fuller description l. 1277 f.: she is to bleed on a block (*ἐπίξηνον*), as though she was an ox or a sheep. Secondly, in the narrative of Orestes, *Eumen.* 625 (*κόπτει πεδίονας ἄνδρα κτλ.*), the verb at once recalls the axe, and that the axe of the butcher, as in Homer *Il.* xvii. 521, cf. *Od.* xiv. 425. It might of course be used in the general sense of 'slaughter,' but this would certainly weaken the description, which is otherwise highly picturesque in its definiteness. If the sword had been meant, another word must have been used (e.g. *παίειν*). A spear is still more out of the question; the verb is only thus used in the sense of 'smiting' with a spear on the back (*Od.* viii. 528).

While these two descriptions are directly in favour of the axe, we have another possible indication of it in the weird vision of the King's death *Agam.* 1127, where the murderer is compared to a bull goring him *μελαγκέρφ μηχανήματι ἐν πέποισι*. What Cassandra 'saw' may well have been the crescent-bladed axe like the horns of a bull beneath the robe. The words *ἀπέδikes*, *ἀπέταμες*, l. 1410, may also furnish evidence to the same effect. The ordinary explanation of the former, 'thou didst fling him away,' is altogether bad; for, if the 'flinging away' is taken to mean that she thrust him from her in a literal sense, the word is quite inappropriate; while, if we understand it metaphorically in the sense of 'cast off,' it is weak and pointless. In both verbs the preposition evidently has the same value and is simply intensive, being thrown in partly for the sake of alliteration with *ἀπόπολις*. Thus, as *ἀπέταμες* does not mean 'cut off' from anything in particular, *ἀπέδikes* should be taken equally simply, and the likeliest explanation of the two may be found, if we regard them as suggesting and suggested by a hatchet (*δίκελλα*) and a sword respectively: 'thou didst hack and hew him.' We have thus one of those verbal quibbles or assonances, which are a marked feature of the language of Aeschylus. The indirectness of the allusion in the first word is no more than is usual. The fanciful connection which Dr. Verrall has noticed as present to the poet's mind between *δίκεν*, *δικεῖν* and *δίκελλα* (see his notes on *Agam.* 560, *Choeph.* 946 and *Septem c. Theb.* app. ii.) would amply cover and explain the pun in *ἀπέδikes*.

Coming lastly to Clytemnestra's own description, *Agam.* 1384-6, we have an em-

phatic allusion to 'two blows' followed by a 'third,' which is intentionally separate. This surely accords well with the supposition that there were two implements: she first cut him down with two blows of the axe falling on the head, which was an easy mark; then, when he was down and at her mercy, she finished him with one thrust of the sword of Aegisthus.

We can find only a general presumption on the fact that Sophocles (*Elect.* 99) and Euripides (*Hec.* 1261) gave Clytemnestra the axe. But at any rate this cannot have been borrowed, as a scholiast suggests, by a hasty inference from Homer *Od.* iv. 535, 'he (Aegisthus) slew him like an ox at the stall, when he had feasted him'; for in the other version (*Od.* xi.), where the very same phrase is repeated, the sword is expressly mentioned (424). On the other hand it is likely enough that Sophocles and Euripides followed a dramatic precedent and brought in the axe

as familiar, leaving out the sword. That Aeschylus placed both in her hands is the only theory which appears to fit with the data. His reason for adding the sword is obvious: it was to bring into clear relief the instrumentality of Aegisthus in the fulfilment of the inherited curse on the house of Atreus, to which he belonged. From this point of view Aegisthus was the chief agent, Clytemnestra the accessory.

This solution involves no technical difficulty either as regards the execution of the double murder or the presentation by means of the *ecyclema*. We may conjecture that Cassandra was despatched with the axe after Agamemnon and the sword then used on Agamemnon's body in gratuitous cruelty, and that Clytemnestra was exhibited with the sword in her hand and the axe lying at her feet.

G. C. W. WARR.

#### ON PINDAR *PYTH.* II. 161 *sqq.*

In a note on Pindar *Pythia* ii. 161 *sqq.* (*C.R.* vol. xii. No. 4, p. 208), *στάθμας δέ τινος ἐλκόμενοι περισσᾶς κ.τ.λ.*, my first edition is quoted, though in the second (1893) I give a different explanation according to which the lines in question 'form part of the equine metaphor.' A glance at Xenophon *περὶ ἵππικῆς*, chap. v., shows that *στάθμη* could hardly mean 'the halter of a horse as used at the present day'; and any groom or veterinary surgeon

would assure us that a horse does not 'naturally gall his chest' by straining at a weighted halter passed through a ring. The 'weight' on the said halter is as light as may be, and has very slight similarity to a plummet. The general meaning of 'measure,' which I have proposed for *στάθμα* in this passage, is found in *σταθμῶν, ἀσταθμῆτος*.

C. A. M. FENNELL.

#### NOTE ON THE ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥ.

AMONG the lately-discovered Λόγια Ἰησοῦ one that has most excited speculation is No. 5 *ἔγειρον τὸν λίθον καὶ ἐκείνη εὐρήσεις με, σχίσον τὸ ξύλον καὶ ἐγὼ ἐκεί εἰμι*. The doctrine is ridiculed by Lucian *Hermotim.* 81 *ἀκούομεν*

*δὲ αὐτοῦ* (a professor of philosophy) *λέγοντος ὡς καὶ ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ διὰ πάντων πεφοίτηκεν, οἷον ξύλων καὶ λίθων καὶ ζώων, ἅχρι καὶ τῶν ἀτιμοτάτων*.

W. HEADLAM.

## SALLUST. ORAT. PHILIPPI IN SENATU § 7.

*At tum erat Lepidus latro cum calonibus et paucis sicariis, quorum nemo non diurna mercede vitam mutaverit: nunc est pro consule cum imperio...*

There is some MS. authority for omitting *non* after *nemo*, and editors have never known which reading to accept: the latest text that I have seen reads *nemo*. The meaning supposed by this must, I conceive, be 'fellows that were not likely to sacrifice their lives for a mere day's pay'—and therefore were not formidable. Usage proves that this is not the point. Isocrates 109 b says ἡγούμαι... πολλὴν ἀπληστίαν ἔχειν ὅστις προαιρεῖται κινδυνεύειν ὥστ' ἢ ταῦτα (i.e. δυναστείαν καὶ πλοῦτον) λαβεῖν ἢ στερηθῆναι τῆς ψυχῆς. *Nothing is worth that price but glory, ἡς ἀξίον ὀρεγομένου καὶ ὅσον οἱ τ' ἐσμὲν ὀτιοῦν πάσχειν.* ἴδοις δ' ἂν καὶ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν τοὺς ἐπικεικτάτους ὑπὲρ ἄλλου μὲν οὐδενὸς ἂν τὸ ζῆν ἀντικαταλλαξαμένους, ὑπὲρ δὲ τοῦ τυχεῖν καλῆς δόξης ἀποθνήσκων ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις ἐθέλοντας... Similarly Lycurg. 159. 2, Kaibel *Ep.* 21,

Verg. *A. v.* 230, xii. 49 *vitam or letum pro laude pacisci*. The patriot is described as willing to give his life, or body and soul, for his country, Dio Cass. xxxvi. 10, lii. 14. But the φιλάργυρος is the man who will sell his soul for gold: Pollux iii. 112 gives Attic phrases to describe him, τὴν ψυχὴν ἂν ἀναλλάξας τοῦ χρυσίου, τὴν ψυχὴν ἂν ἀργυρίου προέμενος. To that class belongs the *latro*, the mercenary—for that is the original meaning of the word (Servius on *Aen.* xii. 7 and the dictionaries), the *needy adventurer*; Plaut. *Stich.* 135 *vosne latrones et mendicos homines magni penditis?* And what is the contemptuous phrase for such a hireling? *Bacchid.* 20 *latronem, suam qui auro vitam venditat*; a jesting description laboured in *Mostell.* 354–361 *isti qui hosticas trium nummum causa subeunt sub falas*. The phrase then, as one might expect, is Greek; and the point is that such hired assassins care nothing for the cause, but will sell their lives for money.

W. HEADLAM.

## I.—CICERO, AD ATT., I. 1. 2.

NOSTRIS rationibus maxime conducere videtur Thermum fieri cum Caesare. Nemo est enim ex iis, qui nunc petunt, qui, si in nostrum annum reciderit, firmiter candidatus fore videatur, propterea quod curator est viae Flaminiae: quae cum erit absoluta, sane facile eum libenter nunc ceteri consuli acciderim.

The italicised passage has caused very great difficulties. For the various emendations proposed I refer to *Tyrrell's Correspondence of Cicero*, Vol. I.<sup>2</sup> p. 148. Boot (*Cic. Epist. ad Att.*<sup>2</sup> p. 5) points with a comma after Flaminiae and writes quae erit tum absoluta sane facile; eum libenter nunc Caesari consulem acciderim and Tyrrell (l.c.) seems to favour the same reading. It may be noted in passing that he ascribes *acciderim*, which is Bosius's correction if we may trust Boot, to Boot himself. Exception can hardly be taken to *tum* for *eum*, and *acciderim* to *acciderim* is hardly liable to any objection on the palaeographic side. But *accidere* is a nonce-word at Plaut. *Merc.* 432:

tris minas accudere etiam possum, ut triginta sient—

where *accudere* means 'manage to raise (coin outright)' and we have here no fit place for *acciderim*, though I am willing to allow all of Tyrrell's claims for the correspondence of the diction of Cicero's letters with the diction of comedy: only the diction must correspond. The charge of *ceteri consuli* to *Caesari consulem* is not easy to my mind. A variant reading in the margin of M changes *nunc ceteri* of that manuscript to *nuntiteri*, while Z, teste Lambino, reads *nunciteri consuli acciderunt*. I cannot see how we have any warrant here to change *ceteri* to *Caesari*.

If, in spite of this scepticism, I may operate with all the emendations approved by Boot for this passage, save *acciderim* whose incorrectness seems to me certain, I propose for *acciderim* to read *addicerem*, imputing to an ignorant and careless scribe first syllable transposition, *addicerem*, whence next *acciderim*. The confusion of

-em with -im is too common to raise a question and may have antedated the transposition of -dic' to -cid-, thus giving to that transposition the character of an emendation on the part of the scribe. Thus my sentence becomes: eum libenter nunc Caesari consulem addicerem (sc. si. possem); here *libenter addicerem* is much like *vellem addicere*, and the whole means 'I would fain make him over now to be Caesar's colleague.'

I think however that we may mend the entire passage with very much less textual juggling than any of the corrections yet proposed has offered. Cicero has been saying: Thermus seems likely to be a stronger candidate than any in the present canvass if he should stand again next year when I propose to come up, and this because he is the superintendent of the Flaminian road: quae cum erit absoluta sane facile eum [libenter] nunc alteri consuli addicerem. 'and, supposing him to have finished this road (by that time), I should be quite ready (*sane facile*) now to adjudge him (as colleague) to the other consul.

In this reading of the passage *libenter* is excised as a gloss. The reading *alteri* for *ceteri* is based on the common half-uncial and minuscule confusion of 'open' a with ci, according to which *alteri* would give *ciliteri*, whence, *citeri* (as in Z and the marginal variant in M) by a haplography between l and the tall form of i (cf. Lindsay's *Textual Emendation in Plautus* pp. 82, 84). The *ceteri* of M would be an emendation of *ciliteri*.

There is an anacoluthon in the sentence however, *quae cum erit absoluta*, a future perfect, is balanced by an unreal Apodosis *nunc addicerem*, but as *sane facile...addicerem* is practically equivalent to *vellem addicere* we can defend the combination of a not-yet-realized future protasis with an unreal apodosis. It does not commit us to any 'potential' subjunctive speculations if we should supply here a fresh protasis to *addicerem*, viz: *si possem*.

Bosius imagined there was a pun here between Thermus, which in Greek (θέρμυς) meant 'lupine,' and *cicer* 'vetch' in allusion to Cicero's name. One of Tyrrell's ventures, based on that suggestion, is *eo libenter* <Ther> mum *ciceri* consulem obduxerint: 'therefore they will gladly enough run Thermus against Cicero, the lupine against the vetch.' We might retain the pun and read *ciceri* for *citeri* (*ceteri*). This would give us, still reading *addicerem*: 'On the completion of his road I should be glad to

set him down now (as colleague) to the vetch-consul, myself,' that is to say 'I wish I were as sure of election now as he will be on the completion of his road.'

## II.—Plautus, Captivi 1-3.

The *editio minor* of Goetz and Schoell reads these verses as follows:

hos quos uidetis stare hic captivos duos,  
illi qui astant—i stant ambo, non sedent:  
*hoc* uos mihi testes estis me uerum loqui.

This is practically the consensus of the manuscripts save for the words in italics; i is a correction for *hi* and *hoc* a correction for *hos*; while J. reads *os quos* for the third line. The other modern text-editions agree with that quoted in pronouncing *illi qui astant* corrupt, viz: Leo's and Sonnenschein's. Schoell, in the triumvirate edition, reports various emendations for this passage, and to these the reader is referred. His own proposal is *ingati* qui astant, which has nothing to commend it textually. Brix<sup>4</sup> reads *in vinclis* qui astant and Lindsay merely reprints the text of Fleckeisen which had been adopted for his school-edition, and so reads *uincti quia* astant. The above statement will serve to show that the corruptness of the passage is universally admitted, while none of the emendations stands in a conceivable relation with the *illi* that is rejected.

I propose to emend the text as follows:

1. hos quos uidetis stare hic captiuos duos—
3. hoc uos mihi testes estis me uerum loqui
2. illi<c> qui asta[n]t<is>—i stant ambo non sedent.

I remark that illi<c> for illi is not necessary to my conjecture as the adverb *illi* might stand without -c. My restoration of -is in *asta[n]t<is>* is based on the assumption of its loss by haplography with the following *i stant*. It is assumed that the copyist changed the resulting *astat* to *astant* by way of making the word construe. This was complicated with a change of order.

In the ultimate archetype of the Palatine recension I assume that verses 1-2 stood as follows in their initial words:

hosquos—  
hocuos—



This was very like a homoioarchaion. Now in B the second of these lines reads *Hos uos* (*hoc uos* being a correction in B<sup>2</sup>), and with it DE agree, while J reads *os quos* which shows even more the influence of the first line. The possibility of confounding C and Q in a capital manuscript is proved by A's reading at Merc. 781 *HAERQUASSA* for *haec uassa*, and if, as seems to me not unlikely, this demonstrates rather the confusion of the group *qu* with *cu*, than of Q with C, why it is just that group we have here.

We have seen that the initial words of what appear as lines 1 and 3 in the extant Palatine manuscripts show a corruption by way of the assimilation of 3 to 1; this may, I think, be taken to show that the similarity of their ductus made itself felt to the copyists. My emendation supposes that their order was 1 and 2, and this supposition throws light on the assimilation of the second to the first of these lines.

Let us call the original manuscript as pictured above P. A copy of this read, I will assume

1. *nosquos*—

2. *noquos*—, and this copy we will call P'.

In P<sup>B</sup> this second line was rendered

*hos uos*—

while still another copy, P', got from it

*hos quos*—

Back of P<sup>B</sup> and P', but subsequent to P', let us postulate a copy P<sup>C</sup>. In this copy the scribe skipped line 2 altogether because of its homoioarchaion, but either put it in directly after line 3 or put it on the margin whence it got back into subsequent copies out of its proper order.

The chief difficulty to be met here is that the mistake occurs so early in the play. It is easy to claim that a scribe would be less likely to make a mistake there, but this it would be hard to demonstrate when the mistake is of so nearly mechanical a nature. It would help us to form an idea if we knew whether the copyist was working by the hour or by the piece. In the latter case he might not have stopped to take a rest after the previous play, but have hurried on to finish his task. In Studemund's Apograph fol. 432<sup>v</sup> (= Quaternion liiii, 8<sup>a</sup>) lines 12–19 are devoted to a colophon of the following description:

T[MACCI PLA]UTI  
MENAECMI EXP[LICIT]INC[ipit] TRINUMMUS  
FELICITER

The next folio, 433<sup>v</sup> (= Quat. lv, 1<sup>r</sup>) leaves one blank line at the top of the page, doubtless to have been filled out with names of characters, and goes straight on with the prologue to the *Trinummus*. To a copyist plodding on mechanically Trin. 1–3 would be as liable to offer occasions of error, I should think, as any other three lines of a play.

Another objection arises, viz. whether *uos* can be combined with *illic*. In the last resort *illic* might be corrected to *istic*, but that does not seem to me necessary. In my interpretation of this passage *astatis* refers to the late-comers at the extreme rear of the audience, cf. vss. 10–12:

negat hercle ille †ultimus, accedito,  
si non ubi sed eas locus est, est ubi ambules,  
quando histrionem cogis mendicariet.

Here it is perhaps fair for us to infer from *sedeas* and *cogis* that *accedito* is in the 2nd person. At any rate the man who is *ille* in vs. 10 has become *tu* (*iste*) in vss. 11–12. These lines therefore seem to me to give some warrant to the combination of *uos* and *illic* in vss. 2–3.

Two grounds of a general nature may be given for the use of *illic*: (1) As *hic* in vs. 1 refers to the stage, it may be questioned whether any word but *illic* would refer to the rear end of the audience; (2) the *uos* of vs. 2 may not include all the persons included in the subject of *uidetis* (vs. 1): *uidetis*, we will say, refers to the entire audience while *uos* refers to those only who are standing far back in the rear. In other words, *istic* would have referred to the entire audience and not to the late-comers only standing up in the rear; while if it was necessary to subdivide the audience, *uos illi* and *uos hic* would be used.

It may be that this reasoning does not sufficiently explain why we have *illic* and not *istic*. In that case we can correct to *istic*, basing the change on Most. 1064, where A reads *ILICINTRALIMENISTASTATE*, but P reads . . . *astate illic*. The editors very plausibly correct to *ist* < *i* > *astate*.

I note that *astatis* may well be for *apstatis*, with the phonetic treatment of *ostendere* for *\*obstendere*. The only use of this word put down in the lexica is in the form *abstes* (Horace). If it was spelt *abstatis* the writing *adstatis*, whence *astatis*, would come very easily. For the confusion of B with D I refer to A's *AEBIS* for *AEDIS* at Truc. 252 (cf. *Class. Rev.* x. 155), and Lindsay (Text. Emend. p. 84) notes *b/d*. Doubtless either

*absta* or *adsta* was pronounced *asta* except when there was a special reinforcement due to the etymological consciousness. I do not doubt that the impv. *a(b)sta* occurs elsewhere in Plautus in the sense 'stand off, back,' Grk. ἀπόστηθι (Aristophanes) and ἀπόστα (Menander). The difficulty of *illic astate* (Rud. 836, cf. Bach in Studemund's Studien ii. p. 268) will be greatly relieved if we may translate *astate* by 'stand back.'

Our passage will then lend itself to the following rendering, reading *illic* and not *istic*.

'These whom you see standing here, these captives twain,  
—I should like you to witness that I'm speaking truth,  
Those of you standing-back yonder—why *they* both stand and sit not down.'

With this interpretation the passage does not seem to me to lose in point. Indeed, the 'gag' seems to me very good. In

none of the other prologues is the audience directly charged to look upon the actors already 'made up' for exhibition. Here after pointing out the two captives the prologizer solemnly tells the audience that he is going to tell them the truth. We may imagine him to proceed solemnly and the audience to fall agape till the prologizer comes out with the ponderous truism 'they are both standing, not sitting.' There may further be an adroit fling at the late-comers standing at the rear, first if the prologizer pointed them out far away (*illic*), and second when the actors are shown to be standing ready when the curtain rises while the spectators are not yet all seated.

That a broad 'gag' of some sort should come at the very introduction of the prologue need not surprise us. I cite Men. 1-3.

salutem primum iam a principio propitiam  
mihi atque uobis, spectatores, nuntio.  
apporto uobis Plautum—lingua, non manu.

EDWIN W. FAY.

#### NOTES ON CATULLUS AND ON THE AGRICOLA OF TACITUS.

CATULLUS 39, 11 *parcus Vmber codd.*

It is worth while noticing with regard to the much contested epithet that the MS. of Catullus which Petrarch had, or at least read, apparently gave *parcus*, thus removing the reading at least one generation further back toward the archetype than our existing MSS. can carry it. See the gloss in Petrarch's hand on his MS. of Vergil ('the Ambrosian Vergil'), fol. 29, *Geor.* ii. 192 (*Aut parcus Vmber, aut obesus Etruscus*) as mentioned by De Nolhac in his *Pétrarque et l'Humanisme*, p. 140. I have not seen attention called to this point.

Cat. 63, 77 *lenumque* (*leuumque G1*) *pectoris hostem GO*.

The reading in *O* is perfectly clear. In Clédat's facsimile of *G* the reading appears to be the same, but as if corrected from *leuumque*. Yet all the editors so far as I know, who have examined the original, give *leuumque*. The MS. will evidently repay a new glance at this verse. The old emendation of *pectoris* to *pecoris*, found even in at least two minor MSS., seems certain. But *laeum* has never appealed to me as satisfactory. The augural explanations offered for it are too far-fetched. I have myself tried to explain it as a bit of realistic speci-

fication, but without much conviction of success. More recently I have wondered whether Catullus did not write *lentumque*. To the fierce resentment of the goddess even the natural ferocity of the *pecoris hostis* seems too slow and hesitating. So her hurrying words of eager urgency to rage flow on even while she is yet loosing the yoke from his neck, and she sends him off in a tumult of madness.

Cat. 64, 309 *roseo niuee codd. roseae niueo Guarinus et al.*

The emendation of Guarinus can hardly be supported by citing the reading of *O* in 64, 31 as an instance of precisely similar confusion in the MSS., for in this case *optato finitae* is very probably what Catullus wrote, as Professor Ellis pointed out. The MS. reading in 64, 309 should, I think, also be retained, as some few critics, though for varying reasons, have from time to time claimed. It may perhaps find some support in the verses given in *Augustin. de Mus.* iii. 2 (Baehrens *Fragm. P. R.* p. 403, no. 175) *ite igitur, Camenae | . . . quae lavitis capillum | purpureum Hippocrenae | fonte*, etc. Here the roseate tresses of the Muses are not, I think, characteristic of their youthful beauty (for it is not the hair of youth that is

proverbially rosy), but of the rosy effulgence of that divine nature, which they, like the Fates, shared. So *Venus auertens rosea ceruice refulsit*, when she revealed herself as *vera dea* (Verg. *Aen.* i. 402). In Catullus the rosy locks of the Fates are specified to afford the familiar colour-contrast with the white fillets that matched the rest of their clothing. The crimson *instita* is mentioned to mark the dignity of their garb.

Cat. 110, 2 *accipiunt pretium quae facere instituunt codd.*

The device of accounting for *quae* by supposing it equivalent to *eorum quae* (neut.) is at best objectionable. The reading in both *G* and *O* is *que* (in *O* in ligature), for which I would suggest *quod*, 'they easily get their regular market price.' *Pretium facere*, 'to set a price,' is supported by Plaut. *Pers.* 586 '*indica; fac pretium.*' '*Tua merx est; tua indicatio est*'; and a similar error of *que* (in ligature) for *quod* is found in both *O* and *G* in 51, 5 *miseroque* (corrected in *G* to *miseroquod*), and in *O* in 66, 41 *feratque* (where, however, *G* has *ferat qd'*). I have before mentioned this suggestion, but so briefly and in so obscure a place that I trust I may be pardoned for repeating it in this connection.

Tac. *Agr.* 28 *mox ad aquam atque ut illa raptis secum plerisque Britannorum codd.*

Halm's *egressi et cum* seems as satisfactory as anything that has yet been proposed in the puzzling coil of *raptis secum*, and Selling's *utilia* for *ut illa* appears to me certain. But *ad aquam atque utilia* needs no further adjustment to fit in with *egressi* directly, as may be seen from such a passage as Liv. v. 20, 10 *ad praedam Veientem . . . proficis-*

*cerentur*. The only further change necessary is in the word following *utilia*, which I should read as *raptim* (from *rapti*). The passage would then stand *mox ad aquam atque utilia raptim egressi et cum plerisque Britannorum*, etc. *Raptim* occurs a dozen times in Tacitus, and always with the idea of something like disorderly haste, such as must have characterised these hurried landings of the Usipii.

Tac. *Agr.* 34 *nouissimae res et extremo metu corpora defixere aciem in his uestigiis codd.*

One must evidently choose between *corpora* and *aciem*, and *corpora defixere* sounds to me much more true in this setting than *defixere aciem*, though I cannot share the conviction of Wex that, leaving the question of *corpora* aside, *defixere aciem* would be impossible here. But the attempt to heal the difficulty by quietly dropping out *aciem*, with Rhenanus and others down to Wex, appears to me unreasonably arbitrary, nor am I satisfied with the suggestion that *aciem* is merely a gloss upon *corpora*. Perhaps *aciem* is simply an error for *etiam*, in which case the passage would run *nouissimae res extremo metu corpora defixere etiam in his uestigiis*, etc. *Et* may be considered as a gloss of some student who imagined, and wished to point out, that their desperate plight and the extremity of their fear were co-ordinate causes in planting the Britons where Agricola found them. Yet there are other and common ways of accounting for the unauthorised appearance of an *et* in the MSS.

ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL.

Wesleyan University, Middletown, Ct.

## THE SEQUENCE AFTER *NE* PROHIBITIVE.

### I.

The question as to the sequence after *Ne* Prohibitive in Classical Latin is one of the most interesting that have emerged in recent years, and America has produced in the person of Professor Elmer a Protagonist<sup>1</sup> whose verdicts on the subject command attention and cannot be ignored or overlooked. In the following papers it is intended to present the results of independent

investigation in the same field, results that are found largely confirmatory of his main position, and it is singular that simultaneously with the researches at Cornell University there should have been developed in the North of Scotland a kindred inquiry on kindred lines coming substantially to the same conclusion, viz. the overthrow of the Madvigian canon as absolutely controlling the sequence in question.

The incidents which led to the critical inquiry in Aberdeen were originally local

<sup>1</sup> Professor Elmer's views are found in *American Journal of Philology*, vol. xv. 2 (1894), and in volume of *Cornell Studies in Cl. Philology*, 1898.

and personal and need not here be detailed. Suffice it to say that Aberdonian scholars, with some trifling exceptions, adhered to the former lead of an Aberdonian scholar, Dr. Melvin, on the subject, and had dared to dissent from the Madvigian canon, thereby arousing some local controversy on the point. In the course of the controversy the present writer was delighted afterwards to find that a strong diversion had set in from the Transatlantic side, and that although English scholarship seemed for a time to have succumbed to the Madvigian influence, the fastnesses of the North refused to accept the yoke, and Aberdeen can now claim to have been the first to maintain the old doctrine and disown the now crumbling heresy.

The canon of Madvig which he sought to impose (*Opuscula* 2. 105) was that which enjoined the use of *Ne* with the Perfect Subjunctive as the proper form of prohibition or deprecation, and denied or denounced the use of *Ne* with the Present Subjunctive (in *prosa oratione prorsus inusitatum*), except in what he chose to call general maxims of prohibition. The practical effect was to reduce almost every verb to the maimed condition of Preteritive Verbs, where of course *Ne* with the Perf. Subj. is, from the nature of these verbs, the recognised and

sole machinery. *Ne meminervis* is the proper formula, but it does not follow that with another verb having ampler forms, *don't recall* or *don't bear in mind* should be limited, e.g. to *ne sis recordatus*, and that *ne recorderis* should be tabooed when addressed to an individual. On the contrary, the absurdity of the canon should have been manifest when *ne sis recordatus* is pronounced the right thing, but not *ne sis* (*stultus*, e.g.) which on Madvig's canon we must not address to an individual. For, if the canon were correct, *ne fueris recordatus* ought to be the sole formula, whereas *ne sis recordatus*, implying that *ne sis* can specifically prohibit, is a demonstration of its futility, when imposed as absolute and indefeasible.

In the present paper, which is merely preliminary, I give only a few salient facts, not from classical ground proper but from important outlying fields, showing the instinct of the Latin tongue as strongly opposed to Madvig's dictatorship.

In a fairly representative book such as Alfred Henderson's '*Latin Quotations*,' (1869) representing the cream of Latin diction in all the eras, I had the curiosity to count up the several instances of *Ne Prohibitive*. The following is the enumeration:—

*Ne with Pres. Subj.*

Actum ne agas.  
Ad finem ubi perveneris, ne velis reverti.  
Aliena ne concupiscas.  
Ante victoriam ne canas triumphum.  
Aurea ne credas, quaecumque nitescere cernis.  
Cave ne quidquam incipias quod post poeniteat.  
Cave ne titubes.  
De re amissa irreparabili ne doleas.  
Esurienti ne occurras.  
Ignem igni ne addas.  
Leonis catulum ne alas.  
Maritimus quum sis, ne velis fieri terrestres.  
Mulieri ne credas, ne mortuae quidem.  
Ne, cinerem vitans, in prunas incidas.  
Ne credas undam placidam non esse profundam.  
Ne cui de te plus quam tibi credas.  
Ne cuius invidias.  
Ne depugnes in alieno negotio.  
Ne despicias debilem.  
Ne gladium tollas, mulier.  
Ne quid expectes amicos facere quod per te queas.  
Ne quid moveare verborum strepitu.  
Ne sis unquam elatus.  
Ne tentes aut perforce.  
Ne vile velis.  
Neque nulli sis amicus neque multis.  
Nulli te facias nimis sodalem.  
Quod sis esse velis, nihilque malis.  
Rosam quae praeteriit, ne quaeras iterum.  
Uni navi ne committas omnia.

30 Examples.

*Ne with Perf. Subj.*

Ad consilium ne accesseris, antequam voceris.  
Amico ne maledixeris.  
Ne vidēris quod videris.  
Malum bene conditum ne moveris.  
Ne cuius dextram injeceris.  
[Ne malorum meminervis.]  
Nemini dixeris quae nolis efferri.  
Officium ne collocaris in initum.  
Quod dubites, ne feceris.  
Quod tibi fieri non vis, alteri ne feceris.

9 Examples (*ne meminervis* not being in dispute).  
N.B. Four of these instances are with the usually instantaneous verbs *dico* and *facio*.



In these 30 are included three Present Subjunctives where the negative is *nec* or *nullus*, virtually equivalent to *ne*, and two examples with *cave* prefixed which may be held as auxiliary in proof. Deducting these, however, for sake of Draconian rigidity, there remain 25, all with *ne* and *Pres. Subj.* against 9 with *Perf. Subj.*<sup>1</sup> Here, it is manifest, the artificial distinction which the followers of Madvig have rigidly formulated between general and particular prohibitions utterly breaks down; for, if it were valid and binding, these current proverbs and maxims ought to be all in *Pres. Subj.*, and not one ought to be in the *Perf. Subj.* tense. But the distinction is futile, and the real *differentia*, as Prof. Elmer has indicated, appears to lie in the conception of the action forbidden, according as it is instantaneous or continuous: in the former case the *Perf. Subj.* is naturally preferred; in the latter the *Pres. Subj.*

N.B.—In the same volume I noted, in a cursory examination, only one example of *Noli* (p. 169) but *four* of *ne* with *Imperative* (pp. 3, 145, 242, 243).

Another important outlying field, though not strictly classical, is the Vulgate version of the Scriptures, which may be claimed as representing the outcome of the Latin Genius at the close of the old classical era and ought to yield evidence of an interesting and valuable kind. In the investigation pursued I have taken the Vulgate of Popes Sixtus V.

and Clement VIII., first for the Old Testament, and thereafter for the New Testament, with results almost uniform throughout the vast area.

These results, which may be held as substantially correct, may be briefly summarised as follows:—

1. *Noli*, very common, especially with a verb of fear (*timere*, *pavere*, &c.).

2. *Non* with *Pres. Subj.* not infrequent. *Non* with *Fut. Indic.*, not infrequent, as in the prohibitions of the Decalogue.

Sometimes simply predicting, as Job 6, 30. *Non* with *Imperative*, only in limitation to individual *word*, as *Non nobis*, Domine, Ps. 115, 1.

3. *Ne* with *Imperative* seems not to occur. *Ne* with *Pres. Subj.* is vastly preponderant both in general and in individual prohibitions. Prohibitions of *customs* or *usages* are as a rule so expressed as e.g. Deuteronomy 14, vv. 3, 10, 12, 21.

*Ne* with *Perf. Subj.* occurs both in general and in individual prohibitions. Rapid and instantaneous prohibitions are for the most part so expressed.

The examples in the Old Testament of *Ne* with *Pres. Subj.* or its equivalents are 344. The examples of *Ne* with *Perf. Subj.* or its equivalents are only 24, and adding the 4 examples of *Ne meminere* not included as of no evidence, the total is only 28, as against 344 of the *Pres. Subj.* The following tables present details.

## VETUS TESTAMENTUM.

## I.—SECTION. PENTATEUCH TO ESTHER INCLUSIVE.

	Pentateuch.	Jos. & Judges.	I.—IV. Reg.	I.—II. Paral.	Ezra, Neh. Esth.	
<i>Noli</i> .....	41	6	27	11	5	90
<i>Non</i> with <i>Pres. Subj.</i> .....	12	1	9	1	2	25
<i>Ne</i> with <i>Pres. Subj.</i> .....	40	10	22	4	6	82
— with <i>cave</i> , <i>obsecro</i> , <i>quaero</i> , &c. ....	26	7	1	0	1	35
— by <i>nec</i> , <i>nihil</i> , &c. ....	11	2	4	6	0	23
<i>Ne</i> with <i>Perf. Subj.</i> .....	0	0	2	2	0	4
— with <i>do.</i> and <i>obsecro</i> , &c. ....	0	0	0	0	0	0
— by <i>nec</i> , <i>nil</i> , &c. ....	0	0	0	0	0	0

N.B.—The four occurrences of *Perf. Subj.* in this section are—

I. Regum 3, 17; 20, 38; and II. Paral. 6, 42; 26, 18.

<sup>1</sup> A similar proportion of 3 to 1 holds in the case of the Latin Mottoes Heraldic in *Burke's Peerage*: viz.

<i>Pres. Subj.</i>	<i>Perf. Subj.</i>
<i>Ne obliviscaris.</i>	<i>Ne te quaesiveris extra.</i>
<i>Ne tentes aut perfee.</i>	
<i>Ne vile velis.</i>	

## II.—SECTION. FROM JOB TO MALACHI INCLUSIVE.

	Job.	Psalmi.	Proverb.	Cantic.	Eccles.	Isaias.	Jerem.	Lament.	Ezek.	Dan.	XII. Minor Proph.	
Noli .....	1	18	11	1	2	20	36	1	3	2	15	110
Non with Pres. Subj. ....	0	9	3	0	1	2	5	1	0	0	1	22
Ne with Pres. Subj. ....	7	39	48	0	10	20	21	2	4	1	8	164
— with cave, obsecro, quaero, &c. ....	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
— by nec, nihil, &c. ....	1	0	8	3	3	2	12	0	6	0	1	36
Ne with Perf. Subj. ....	0	9	6	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	19
— with do. and obsecro, &c. ....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
— by nec, nil, &c. ....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

The twenty occurrences of Perf. Subj. in this section are—

Psalmi 22, 11, 19; 27, 12; 37, 1; 38, 21; 40, 17; 49, 16; 55, 1; 109, 1. (N.B.—In two of these there are variants by Pres. Subj. in Hieronymus [Migne, vol. x. p. 154]).

Proverbia 6, 4; 25, 6; 26, 25; 27, 10; 30, 8; 31, 3.

Eccles. 5, 5; 10, 20.

Isaias 58, 7.

XII. Minores, Osee 4, 15 bis.

(Two occurrences of ne memineris in Isaias 43, 18; 64, 9, and two in Psalms 25, 7; 79, 8.)

## CONJOINT RESULT IN OLD TESTAMENT.

	Total Examples.
Noli ... ..	200
Non with Pres. Subj. ... ..	47
Ne with Pres. Subj. and equivalents ... ..	344
Ne with Perf. Subj. and equivalents ... ..	24

In the above we have not included, though we might have done so legitimately, *oriental* deprecations by the *third* person Pres. Subj. which, being indefinite, are virtually = ne with *second* person Pres. Subj.; viz. Exodus 32, 22; I. Reg. 25, 25; II. Reg. 13, 32 and 33.

## NOVUM TESTAMENTUM.

	Matthæus.	Marcus.	Lucas.	Joannes.	Acta.	Romans.	1 Cor.	2 Cor.	Gal.	Eph.	Philipp.	Coloss.	Thess. I. & II.	Tim. I. & II.	Hebr.	Jac.	Petr. I. & II.	Joan.	Apoc.	
Noli .....	27	5	27	13	2	8	11	1	2	8	0	3	3	5	8	7	1	5	3	139
New. Pres. Subj. ....	9	5	13	0	4	1	2	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	42
New. Perf. Subj. ....	6	7	3	0	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	1	1	4	35

N.B.—The 42 passages with Ne and Pres. Subj. are—

Matth. 3, 9; 5, 42; 6, 1; 6, 13; 6, 25; 7, 6; 18, 10; 23, 10; 24, 6; Mark 5, 7; 9, 25; 10, 19 (ter.); Luke 1, 13; 1, 30; 3, 13; 3, 14 (bis); 6, 30; 8, 28; 9, 3; 9, 4; 11, 4; 12, 4; 17, 23; 21, 8; Acts 7, 60; 9, 38; 13, 9; 27, 24; Romans 13, 8; I. Cor. 5, 9; 10, 7; Gal. 5, 13; 5, 15; Eph. 3, 13; Philipp. 4, 6; I. Thess. 3, 14; Hebr. 12, 5; 12, 25; Apoc. 11, 2. About one-half of these rest on aorists conjunctive, the rest on presents imperative, of the Greek.

N.B. 2.—The 35 passages with Ne and Perf. Subj. are—

Matthew 5, 36; 8, 4; 10, 5 (bis); 10, 26; 17, 9; Mark 1, 44; 8, 26; 9, 25; 10, 14; 10, 19 (bis); 13, 7; 13, 21; Luke 3, 8; 9, 3; 10, 7; Acts 10, 15 (11, 9 repeated); 16, 28; 23, 21; Rom. 10, 6; 13, 14; I. Cor. 10, 10; II. Cor. 6, 17; Coloss. 2, 21 (ter.); I. Tim. 5, 1; 5, 22 (bis); I. Peter 3, 14; II. John 1, 10; Apocal. 5, 5; 19, 10; 22, 9; 22, 10. Of these, about 12 are with dixeris or feceris.

In Greek original the *Aorist* Conjunctive is found in all these passages except Mark 10, 14; 13, 7; 13, 21; Luke 9, 3; Acts 10, 15; Romans 13, 14; I. Cor. 10, 10; II. Cor. 6, 17; I. Tim. 5, 22 (bis); II. Ep. John 10; and Apocal. 5, 5. In these last the Greek original has *Present* Imperative. In two of the former list the Greek is elliptic, presenting no verb, simply *ἔπα μὴ*, viz. Apoc. 19, 10 and 22, 9. Thus out of the 35 examples with Perf. Subj., all except 12 plus the two elliptic examples, rest on Aorists in the original.

N.B. 3.—Non (or nihil, &c.) with Pres. Subj. (Prohibitive or Deprecatory) has been noted only in N.T. in Luke 14, 8; John 3, 7; I. Peter 3, 14; I. John 3, 18; Apoc. 2, 10. If these, as being with Pres. Subj. are added as falling under the Ne group, the examples in N.T. of prohibition with Pres. Subj. number 47.

## CONJOINT RESULT FROM BOTH OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

	O.T.	N.T.
Noli ... ..	200	139 = 339
Ne with Pres. Subj., &c. ... ..	344	42 = 386 = (with non, &c., added 5) 391
Ne with Perf. Subj., &c. ... ..	24	35 = 59
∴ Pres. Subj. : Perf. Subj. :: 391 : 59, or more than 6 : 1.		

The Books of the Apocrypha have been similarly examined in their Latin version, and the results need not be detailed, being kindred to those exhibited especially by the Old Testament, showing a considerable preponderance for Ne with the sequence of the Present Subjunctive. Thus in the book of Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) the examples of Ne with Present Subj. amount to 77; of Ne with Perf. Subj. : 18.

The futility of attempting to differentiate between general and special prohibitions is thus evinced by the interplay of the rival forms in such books as Proverbs, or Ecclesiasticus, where maxims of life conveying general prohibitions to nobody in particular are frequently expressed in the Perfect Subjunctive, in entire discordance with the Madvigian canon.

In particular, *per contra*, we call attention to the oldest prohibition, so reputed, in the world's history, the canon against eating the forbidden fruit. It is the first occurrence in Scripture of the Prohibitive Ne, and if any prohibition was ever individual, it must be that addressed to Adam, apart apparently

from Eve, for the verb is in the Hebrew as in the Latin, in the *Singular* number. But what do we find? in defiance of Madvig, there emerges in the Vulgate Ne comedas (Gen. 2, 17).

How the LXX. Greek has adopted a plural οὐ φάγεσθε, it boots not here to inquire, neither need we remark that 'noli,' as a prohibitive form, would here be entirely inappropriate.

On the whole, it appears probable that the *differentia* is to be sought, not in the arbitrary canon of Madvig, but rather in the nature of the action of the verb, the prohibitive of instantaneous actions falling chiefly into the Perfect, that of continuous actions or states falling chiefly into the Present Subjunctive.

The above is only a preliminary reconnoitring of the field, a distant survey of the *champ de bataille*. In our next paper we hope to present evidence from the early Latin time, fairly conclusive in the same direction.

Aberdeen.

W. D. GEDDES.

## PRAETERPROPTER IN GELL. NOCT. ATT. XIX. 10.

THE purpose of this note is primarily to call attention to a hitherto unused illustration of the connection between archaic and colloquial Latin, and incidentally to rescue from ignominy the reputation of a worthy Roman *grammaticus*. Gellius in his *Noct. Att. XIX. 10* writes that on a certain occasion, when a few literary friends were gathered at the house of Cornelius Fronto, architects submitted to Fronto specifications for some projected baths. The story proceeds: *Ex quibus cum elegisset unam formam speciemque veris, interrogavit, quantum esset pecuniae sumptus ad id totum opus absolvendum? cumque architectus dixisset necessaria videri esse sestertia ferme trecenta,*

*unus ex amicis Frontonis: 'et praeterpropter', inquit, 'alia quinquaginta.' Tum Fronto dilatis sermonibus, quos habere de balnearum sumptu instituerat, aspiciens ad eum amicum, qui dixerat, alia quinquaginta esse necessaria praeterpropter eum interrogavit, quid significaret verbum 'praeterpropter.' Atque ille amicus: 'non merum', inquit, 'hoc verbum est, sed multorum hominum, quos loquentis id audias; quid autem id verbum significet, non ex me, sed ex grammatico quaerendum est', ac simul digito demonstrat grammaticum hauri incelebri nomine Romae docentem. Tum grammaticus usitati perulgateque verbi obscuritate motus: 'quaerimus', inquit, 'quod honore quaestionis minime dignum est. Nam*

nescio quid hoc praeinimis plebeum est et in opificum sermonibus quam in hominum doctorum disputationibus notius. At enim Fronto, iam voce atque vultu intentiore: 'itane', inquit, 'magister, dehonestum tibi deculpatumque hoc verbum videtur, quo et M. Cato et M. Varro et pleraque aetas superior, ut necessario et Latino usi sunt?' Thereupon also one of Fronto's friends reads a passage from the Iphigenia of Ennius in which *praeterpropter* occurs. The story proceeds: *Hoc ubi lectum est, tum deinde Fronto ad grammaticum iam labentem*: 'audistine', inquit, 'magister optime, Ennium tuum dixisse *praeterpropter* et cum sententia quidem tali, quali severissimae philosophorum esse obviuationes solent? petimus igitur, dicas, quoniam de Enniano iam verbo quaeritur, quis sit ignotus huiusce versus sensus:

*'Incerte errat animus; praeterpropter vitam vivitur.'*

*Et grammaticus sudans multum ac rubens multum, cum id plerique prolixius riderent, exsurgit et abiens*: 'tibi', inquit, 'Fronto, postea uni dicam, ne inscitiores audiant ac discant.' On the one hand the colloquial or vulgar character of the word under discussion is abundantly proved by the remark of Fronto's friend that it is *multorum hominum quos loquentis id audias*, by the confession of the narrator that *praeterpropter* is a *verbum usitatum pervulgatumque*, and by the scornful words of the *grammaticus* who stigmatizes it as *praeinimis plebeum et in opificum sermonibus.....notius*. On the other hand it occurs in the classical Latin of Cato, Varro and Ennius and is used by *pleraque aetas superior*. Perhaps no better illustration can be found of the fact that

colloquial Latin and archaic formal Latin have much in common. To put it in another way, the *sermo cotidianus* of a given period evidently preserved many words, expressions and constructions, which in an earlier period had been the common property of colloquial and literary Latin, but which contemporaneous literary Latin did not use. This fact has been recognized by Schmalz (e.g. *Z. f.d. Gymn.* 1881, p. 87), and by others, but the failure to recognize it constitutes in the writer's opinion the fundamentally weak point in the attempt which Sittl has made (in the *Jahresbericht ü. Vulgär- u. Spätlatein*, 1891, pp. 226-286) to prove that 'das Vulgärlatein, mit welchem die Latinisten operieren, ist ein Phantasiegebilde.' Words and expressions which are not found in the formal writings of men who are accepted as the literary models of a certain period are not necessarily vulgar or even colloquial, and in inveighing against the practice of those who would thus classify them Sittl is doing a service; but, on the other hand, to prove that a certain word in a piece of literature of Cicero's time, for instance, occurs in the formal Latin of an earlier period does not, as Sittl tacitly assumes throughout his article (e.g. pp. 231-4), disprove its colloquial character. The truth of this fact is well illustrated by *praeterpropter*. This brief discussion has perhaps also accomplished the secondary purpose of this note in showing that the judgment of the maligned *grammaticus* with reference to good usage was better than that of his critics.

FRANK F. ABBOTT.

*The University of Chicago.*

#### DOMI, DOMO (CATULLUS 31, 14).

THE use of *domi* denoting 'of one's own' to which editors of Plautus have called attention (e.g. Tyrrell on *Mil.* 194, myself on *Rud.* 1335) is, I am persuaded, of wider extent than is commonly supposed, and is not limited to Plautus.

The following list of passages is merely a 'prima vindemiatio.'

1. *domi est*: Plaut. *Rud.* 292, 357, 1335, *Bacch.* 225, 365, *Pers.* 45, 122, *Mil.* 1154, *Poen.* 867, *Truc.* 554; Cic. *ad. Att.* x. 14, 2 (*nam id quidem domi est*). But the most interesting passage under this head is Catullus 31, 14. I find I have been antici-

pated by Prof. Tyrrell in my interpretation of the phrase *quidquid est domi cachinnorum*, but it seems worth while to put on record the results of an independent observation. I would punctuate the preceding line somewhat differently from Prof. Tyrrell, so as to make the *vos* emphatic:—

Gaudete vosque, o Lydiae lacus undae;  
Ridete quidquid est domi cachinnorum.

'And do you too rejoice, ye Tuscan waters of my lake; laugh all the rippling laughter that you know'; the clause *quidquid*—



*cachinnorum* I take as a cognate object of *ridete*. My interpretation of the first line agrees with that of Prof. Ellis; cf. too his note on 102, 3. But I wish it were possible to retain the *quoque* of the MSS. The epithet *Lydiae* is not really suitable, because the Lago di Garda is not in Etruria as commonly understood. Could not some epithet beginning with a vowel be suggested to follow *quoque*? *o meae* departs a good deal from the ductus litterarum. Possibly *albidae*, suggestive of the *fluctus fremitusque marinus* of these waters; cf. 63, 87 *umida albicantis loca litoris*. *Umidus* would perhaps be too colourless.

2. *domi habeo*: Plaut. *Mil.* 191-194; Ter. *Ad.* 413.

3. *domi* with other verbs: Plaut. *Cas.*

224, *Cist.* 204, Juvenal 13, 57 (*domi videre*). The usage is here well illustrated and its origin shown by Cic. *ad Fam.* ix. 3 *sed quid ego nunc haec ad te, cuius domi nascuntur?* γλαῦκ' ἐς Ἀθήνας. In Livy vi. 36, 9 *quod domi praeceptum erat* we have a slight departure from the original sense of the word ('what they had been told before-hand').

4. *domo* 'from one's own resources': Plaut. *Bacch.* 648, *Curc.* 685, *Amph.* 637 ('from within'), *Truc.* 454, *Poen.* 216, *Merc.* 355. Livy xxii. 1, 6 illustrates the origin of this use: *magistratus id a domo ferre* 'brought it from home' = 'had it as their own.' Numerous other instances could doubtless be quoted from Livy.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

#### NOTE ON VALERIUS FLACCUS IV. 129-30.

nec iam nova morti  
hinc erit ulla tuae: reges preme, dure, secundos.

Neptune apostrophizes his son Amycus on the eve of the latter's death at the hand of Pollux. Yielding to the higher power of Jupiter he resigns his son to his fate, and ends his farewell with the words above quoted. The words 'reges preme, dure, secundos' have given much trouble, some even applying them to Jupiter. But the change from *tuae* (Amycus) to *dure* (Jupiter) is intolerably abrupt.<sup>1</sup> Ellis (*Journal of Philology*, vol. ix. p. 56) cut the knot by proposing *treme* for *preme*. But the sense obtained is unsatisfactory, and no change is required. The words mean 'do thou crush

those princes only who are not thy match.' From v. 151 we learn that Amycus fought with those who were 'aequae uirtutis egentes,' probably not as the result of deliberate choice, but expressing the simple fact that no one was fit to cope with him. V. 111 indeed tells us that he selected to box with him only those who had 'forma praestantior.' I do not understand the remarks of Mr. Summers (*A study of the Argonauticon of V.F.* p. 74) on these lines: but I do understand that 'tortures' is a mistranslation of 'torquet agens' in v. 111 which surely means that Amycus hurled his victims into the sea. And surely the victims might have the 'forma praestantior' and yet be 'aequae uirtutis egentes,' relatively to Amycus.

J. A. NAIRN.

#### THE CARTHAGINIAN PASSAGES IN THE 'POENULUS' OF PLAUTUS.

THE recent discovery of a collation of the lost 'codex Turnebi' (*T*) in a Gryphus edition of Plautus in the Bodleian Library (*Class. Rev.* xi. 177, 246) makes it possible to provide a more certain text of the Carthaginian passages in the *Poenulus*. With the help of *T* we can trace the text of the 'Palatine' MSS. (*B C D*) further back than their common original (*P*). We can trace

it as far as an archetype (*P*<sup>4</sup>) apparently little inferior in age to the Ambrosian Palimpsest (*A*), the sole representative of the other tradition of the text of Plautus. And we can detect the errors (e.g. *lueui* for *lufui*, v. 945) which were introduced into the text by the scribe of *P*, errors reproduced by all our extant minuscule MSS.

Of the Carthaginian passage of ten lines

(Iambic Senarii), which are spoken by Hanno on his first appearance on the stage (Act v. Sc. i.), and which are followed by a Latin version in eleven (or ten) lines (vv. 950-60), there were two versions in antiquity. One of these (vv. 930-39), providing a smooth and intelligible text, was adopted by the archetype of *P*<sup>4</sup>; the other (vv. 940-49), which offers more difficulty to interpreters, was adopted by the archetype of *A*. But this second version seems also to have been jotted in the margin of the archetype of *P*<sup>4</sup>, having been excerpted, we may guess, from a MS. of the *A* family. For it appeared in *P*<sup>4</sup> incorporated in the text immediately after the first version, but with its first four lines written as three, and these grievously curtailed and corrupted.<sup>1</sup>

In *A* each line is written continuously without division of the words. In *P*<sup>4</sup> both Carthaginian passages had probably the words divided. This division has been in the main preserved in our extant MSS. (*BCD*),<sup>2</sup> and seems to have been preserved in *T* also. But it has probably suffered from the tendency of mediaeval scribes to write short words along with neighbouring long words and to break up foreign vocables into elements that might resemble Latin forms. Nor can we be sure that the variants from *T*, entered on the margin of the Oxford Gryphius, reproduces faithfully the word-division of *T*. Here is a list of them, with the uncertain letters in italic type:—930 ythalonium, 931 erybar, uimysthi, 932 ad ed in (adedin?) bynnui (bymy? possibly belonging to v. 933), 933 bymarob hamolomim, 935 yssiderbrum (-am?), liful, 937 elycothi sith, 938 ydchid lithyly, 939 choth infim (tu-?), 940 exalnim altimocum esse, 945 butune celtummeo (celtu mmco?), mucro liful. We should expect to find, in accordance with the ordinary practice of mediaeval scribes, confusion of the following letters in our MSS.:—(1) *y*, *i*, *u*; especially substitution of *i* for *y*, (2) *c* and *ch*, *t* and *th*, *p* and *ph*, (3) *f* for *ph*. And the transcription of foreign, unintelligible words would aggravate the tendency of a scribe to transpose the vowels of neighbouring syllables or to attach *h* to the wrong consonant of two consonants in proximity. In early minuscule, a script in which *P* and the original of *T*

were apparently written, *c* and *t*, *y* and *r*, *a* and *u* were very similar in form. Both in minuscule and in majuscule script *ii* was easily mistaken for *u*.

Here is what seems to be the best available text of the two versions, with a list of the more important variants. For a full list of variants the student must consult (1) Studemund's Apograph of the Ambrosian Palimpsest (Berlin, 1889), (2) the critical apparatus of the large Teubner edition (Leipzig, 1884), (3) my 'Codex Turnebi of Plautus' (Oxford, 1898).<sup>3</sup> Doubtful letters and words are in italics.

First Version, contained only in *P*<sup>4</sup> (the proto-archetype of (1) *P*, the archetype of our extant minuscule MSS., and of (2) *T*, the 'codex Turnebi').

- 930 ythalonimualonuthsicorathisymacom-  
syth  
chymlachchunythmumysthyalmysthyba-  
ruimysehi  
liphocanethythbynuthiadedinbynuii  
bymarobsyllohomalonimuybhmysyrtho-  
ho  
bythlymmothynnoctothuulechantida-  
maschon  
935 yssidobrimthfelythchylischonchemli-  
ful  
ythbinimysdyburthinnochotnuagorast-  
ocles  
ythemanethihchirsaelychotsithnaso  
bynnyydehilychilygubulimlasibithym  
bodiallytheraynnynnuyslymmonchothiu-  
sim

Notes:—The Greek letter X, the 'nota personae' of Hanno was prefixed to v. 930. The scene-heading was HANNO POENVVS LOQUITVR. 930 ythalonim *P*, ythalonium *T*. The reading of *T* seems at first sight to be confirmed by the MSS. of Rufinus in *Metr. Terent.* vi. 560, 28 K. Rufinus quotes from Sisenna's commentary on the *Poenulus* the explanation of *halonium* (so the MSS.) as the Carthaginian word for god, to be pronounced with the first (i) syllable 'long': Sisenna in commentario Poenuli Plautinae fabulae sic. 'Halonium Poeni dicunt deum; et producenda syllaba metri gratia, sicut exigit iambus). But -ium for -im is a natural change for a mediaeval scribe to make (cf.

<sup>1</sup> How far the corruption is due to the torn or illegible state of the marginal jotting, and how far to erroneous transcription of un-Latin letters, or to an attempt to Latinize un-Latin words, is a point for Semitic scholars to decide.

<sup>2</sup> Notice the interpunctuation in *B* between these words of v. 935 yth chil ys chon chem liful, and these of v. 936 yth binim ysdybur etc., etc.

<sup>3</sup> Beside the actually recorded variants of *T*, one may within limits infer the reading of *T* from the absence of any record of its divergence from the reading of the Gryphius text.

<sup>4</sup> The lengthening of this syllable is mentioned apparently as one of a number of other metrical licences (real or seeming) of Plautus, such as the lengthening of the first syllable of *lātrones*.

v. 1023 below) in order to adapt the ending to a Latin form, and may possibly have been made independently by the scribe of *T* and the scribe of the archetype of the Rufinus MSS. Sisenna's remark clearly proves that the Carthaginian lines are Iambic Senarii like their Latin translation (vv. 950-60). 931. The marginal *erybar* (*eybar*?) *uimysthi* (*uiniysthi*?) of the Oxford Gryphius may be miswritten for *chybaruimysthi* or the like. 932. Whether the Oxford variant *bynuii* (*bynuy*? *byimy*? possibly for *bymy*?) refers to this line or the next (*hamolomim bymy*?) is open to doubt. *P* may have had *bynuii*. 933. The ending of the Oxford marginal entry is difficult to decipher, *hamolomim*, or *-iui*, or *-ine*. It can scarcely be *-inur*. The *urby* of *B* for the *uyby* of *CD* is merely the common mistake of transcribing as *r* the early minuscule form of *y*. 935. In the Oxford marginal entries *o* is often miswritten as *r*, so that *yssiderbrum* (*-am*) may represent *yssidobrum* or the like. The confusion of *-um* and *-im* is frequent both in majuscule and in minuscule MSS. 936. *thimochot B*, *-chut CD*. There is no evidence of *T* to enable us to decide; but the text of *B* in the *Poenulus* is in much better repute than that of the original (*P<sup>cd</sup>*) from which *C* and *D* were directly transcribed. 937. *aelychot P*, *elycothi T*. The initial *e* of the *T*-reading may have been *ae* in the original. 938. *idchillihily P*, *ydychid lithyly T*; *lasibit thim B*, *lasibit thym P<sup>cd</sup>*, 939, *bodi B*, *body P<sup>cd</sup>*; *mon P*, *Tn.l.*; *choth lusim P*, *choth iufim* (*tufim*?) *T*.

Second Version, contained in *A* (the Ambrosian Palimpsest), and, in a less perfect form, in *P<sup>a</sup>* :—

*him*

940 ythalonimualonuthyscorathiisthymaco-  
msyth  
combaitumamtialmellotiambeat  
iulecanthiconaalonimbalumbardechore  
batselliuhunesobinesubicsillimbalim  
esseantidamasconalemuedubertefet  
945 oonobunthunecellhummmommucrolu-  
ful  
altanimauosduberithemhyacharistoclem  
sittesedanecnasotersahelicot  
alemusdubertemurmycopsuestitti  
aoccaaneclitorbodesiussilimlimmimco-  
lus

Notes :—In *P<sup>a</sup>* was prefixed the Scene-heading HANNO (†) POENVS PVNICE (†) DV. (sc. 'Diverbium,' i.e. in Iamb. Sen.) The Scene-heading in *A*, perhaps identical, is now illegible. 940-3. For these four lines *P<sup>a</sup>* had only three, which in *P* appeared in this form :—

N. exanolimuolanussuccurratimistim-altim-  
acumesse  
concubitumabellocutimbeatlulacantic-  
hona  
enuseshuiecsilihpanasseathidmascon

The fourth line in *P<sup>a</sup>* began with *alem* etc.; the fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth correspond closely with vv. 945-9 of *A*. 940 The line began with *exalonim* in *P<sup>a</sup>*. Is the *ex-* a corruption due to a prefixed *X*, the 'nota personae' of Hanno (see above)? The excessive length of the line in *A* and in *P<sup>a</sup>* makes one suspect that a suprascript variant had been incorporated in the verse. If so, the *al* of *altimacumesse* of *P<sup>a</sup>* may have been merely the symbol AL. (i.e. 'aliter'). *A* has between *sicorathi* and *syth* the curious jumble *isthymhimithymacom*. 941 Unfortunately there are no *T*-variants for this line (nor for the three following). The *P*-reading is clearly Latinized (cf. *succurrat* for *sicorathi* in the preceding line). Does *cutim*, compared with *tiam* of *A*, suggest some original like *chthym*? 942 *iulecanthe* (†) *conca A*, *lulacanticcona P*. 943 The opening part of the line in *A* cannot be deciphered with certainty. The *P*-text differs widely from the *A*-text of the remaining part. 944 (end) *fet A*, *fel P*. In majuscule writing *t* and *l* are easily confused. 945 *d(o)ono A*, *ono P*; *bunthunec A*, *butune P<sup>a</sup>*; *celthumucommucro A*, *celtummmucuro P<sup>a</sup>*. 946 *duberithemhu A*, *ouberhenthy P*. 947 *sittesedanec A*, *eteseaneac* (*-nehc*?) *P*; *tersa A*, *ctelia P*. 948 *temurmu A*, *termi P*; *titi A*, *tipti P*. 949 *aocca A*, *aode P*; *iussilimlimmim A*, *iussumlimnim P*.

What is the relation of this second version to the first? Of the end of the play there are also two versions; though, unlike the two versions of the Carthaginian passage, both appear in *A* and in the 'Palatine' recension. The earliest edition of Plautus we may conceive to have been made with the help of stage-copies; and where two stage-copies exhibited different versions, either a choice was made or the two rivals were adopted side by side. The determination of the relation of the second to the first version of the Carthaginian passage would throw welcome light on the history of the 'Palatine' and 'Ambrosian' recensions.

It remains to exhibit the best available text of the other Carthaginian lines and words in Plautus :—

Poen. 994 *Auo* (*AP<sup>a</sup>*).

995 *annobynmythymballebechaedreanech* (*annobynmythymballeudradaitannech A* *anno muthum balle bechaedre anech P<sup>a</sup>*).

- 998 auo (*AP<sup>A</sup>*) donni (*AP<sup>A</sup>*).  
 1002 meharbocca (mepharbua *A*, me har-  
 bocca *P<sup>A</sup>*).  
 1006 rufe (Latin?) ennychoissam (ru-  
 fee(y?)nnychoissam *A*, rufeen nuco istam  
*P<sup>A</sup>*).  
 1010 muphursa (*AP<sup>A</sup>*) miulec hi an na  
 (*P*, *AT n.l.*).  
 1013 lechlachananilimniichot (lechlachan-  
 nanilimniichto *A*, laechlachananiliminichot  
*P*).  
 1016 assam (assam *A*, issam *P*).  
 1017 palumergadetha (palumirgadetha *A*,  
 palumergadetha *P*).  
 1023 muphonnimsycorathim (mufonnim-  
 si(y)ecorathim *A*, muphonnium suchorachim  
 vel -him *P<sup>A</sup>*).  
 1027 gunebelbalsamenigrasa (gunebbal-  
 samemly(i?)ryla *A*, gunebelbalsamenierasan  
 vel -am *P<sup>A</sup>*).

1141 auonesilli (auammailli *A*, haudones-  
 illi *P*).

hauonbanesilliimustine (hauonbanesill . .  
 mustine *A*, hauon bene si illi in mustine *P*).

1142 mepsietenestedumetalannacestimim  
 (mi(e?)pstaetemestzsdumetalan . . . sti—*A*  
 messietenestedum—*T*, mepsietenestedumet-  
 alamnacestimim *P*).

1152 lachanna (lach . . na *A*, lachanam *P<sup>A</sup>*).

I may add that an 'African' word *mu*,  
 strangely included by Charisius (i. 240, 3 K.)  
 among Latin interjections, appears in a  
 play (the 'Caecus' or 'Praedones') at-  
 tributed to Plautus:—

A. Quis tu es qui ducis me? B. Mu. A.  
 Perii hercle, Afer est.

W. M. LINDSAY.

#### BLAYDES' ADVERSARIA.

*Adversaria in varios poetas graecos et latinos*,  
 by FRED. H. M. BLAYDES. Halis Saxoni-  
 um, 1898.

Mr. BLAYDES has given us some 200  
 pages of notes and conjectures on the Latin  
 and Greek poets of which the majority will  
 be of value to many students. To some of  
 the writers—and they are very numerous—he  
 has paid greater attention than to others,  
 and his work certainly deserves the attention  
 of readers of Theognis, Theocritus, Pindar,  
 Horace, of Aeschylus and of the fragments  
 of the Greek Tragedians. It is not merely

that many of his conjectures and emenda-  
 tions of the texts of these writers are in-  
 genious and sometimes almost convincing,  
 but his pages in hundreds of brief notes  
 contain the conjectures of others and happy  
 illustrations or elucidations such as a per-  
 usal of classical writers unremitting during  
 a long life can alone furnish.

Mr. Blaydes' book is we notice printed  
 and published at Halle and the type and  
 matter is as good as the contents are on the  
 whole interesting to students of the classics.

F. C. CONYBEARE.

#### ROHDEN AND DESSAU'S PROSOPOGRAPHIA IMPERII ROMANI.

*Prosopographia Imperii Romani. Pars III.*  
 (P—Z). Consilio et auctoritate Aca-  
 demiae Scientiarum Regiae Borussiae.  
 (Berolini apud Georgium Reimerum.  
 MDCCCLXXXVIII). 25 Marks.

WITH laudable promptitude comes the  
 third volume of a work which, as we can  
 affirm from use of the earlier volumes  
 (published last year), is invaluable for pur-  
 poses of reference. Some notice of the  
 general scope of the book appeared in the  
*Classical Review* for Dec. 1897. It is a sort

of Dictionary of Biography, as complete as  
 anyone could wish where the materials are  
 quite solid and trustworthy, but omitting all  
 theories and reconstructions of character, and  
 giving chiefly facts of public, official, or  
 historical value. It could never have been  
 written without incessant and restless  
 thumbing of indices to other works, as well  
 as of the works themselves. But the labour  
 has not been in vain. The preparation of  
 the third volume was assigned to P. v.  
 Rohden, and, on his illness, was completed  
 by H. Dessau, the compiler of vol. ii, who



has of course had the use of v. Rohden's papers. Vol. iii seems to be printed with the same remarkable care and accuracy which we noticed in the preceding parts of the book. A fourth volume is in prospect, to contain the *fasti consulares* and lists of

magistrates and officials, within the same limits as the rest of the work, i.e. the battle of Actium and the rise of Diocletian to supreme power.

F. T. RICHARDS.

#### SEGEBADE AND LOMMATZSCH'S LEXICON TO PETRONIUS.

*Lexicon Petronianum* composuerunt JOANNES SEGEBADE et ERNESTUS LOMMATZSCH, pp. vii., 274. Leipzig, Teubner. 1898. Mk. 14.

THIS lexicon is an indispensable adjunct to the study of Petronius. It was begun, and a third part of it (*A to hic*) written out in its final shape by Segebad before his untimely death: the second editor then completed the work from Segebad's materials. The plan is the same as that of Menge and Preuss's lexicon to Caesar except that the German translations are omitted. The basis of the lexicon is Buecheler's third edition (1882) but all the fragments are added which are contained in his *editio maior*. Full account is taken of recent conjectures, though the most improbable of the older ones are ignored. The ridiculous practice of

enumerating every occurrence of the commonest words in the language without classification is not adopted: thus the occurrences of *esse* with an adjective predicate are omitted, and those of *et*, which occupy six and a half pages of the lexicon, are distributed under the proper heads. The citations, so far as I have verified them, are accurate. The brief preface includes a short account of the vocabulary and grammar of Petronius which does not call for much remark. It may be doubted whether collocations like *nemo nihil* are grecisms: all over the world the vulgar tongue is fond of the reduplicated negative. The following forms which occur in Mr. Lommatzsch's preface are not in accordance with correct Latinity: *impetratus sum*—*poematibus*—*dua* (neuter)—*ceperat* (for *coeperat* or *inceperat*).

J. P. P.

#### BRADLEY AND BENSON'S PHILOSOPHICAL LECTURES AND REMAINS OF R. L. NETTLESHIP.

*Philosophical Lectures and Remains of R. L. Nettleship*. Edited by A. C. BRADLEY and G. R. BENSON. London (Macmillan), 1897.

THIS is not the place to dwell upon the character and abilities of Lewis Nettleship, either from personal recollections going back to undergraduate days at Balliol, or from a general survey of what he wrote and spoke, and the admirable memoir of him contributed to these volumes by his friend Professor Andrew Bradley. His premature death on Mont Blanc in 1892 was a great loss to Oxford and above all to his college, and even here it may be permissible to refer to the striking and characteristic passage relating to him in Jowett's *College Sermons*. He was not a rapid worker and his time

NO. CVIII. VOL. XII.

was much taken up with teaching; but it seems likely that, if he had lived, he might have produced some original philosophical work of considerable importance.

In these *Remains* what seems to me of the greatest intrinsic value relates to logic. But much the larger part of the two volumes is occupied with Plato, and this is all that I am entitled to deal with in the *Classical Review*. The first volume contains among other things a long essay on *Plato's Conception of Goodness and the Good*. This was meant to be a chapter of a book on Plato which Nettleship undertook for the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. He had himself begun to cut it down considerably. It is easy to understand that the editors did not like to omit anything, nor could they, without to some extent

E E

spoiling the form of the essay. But what might well appear in such a book as Nettleship had in mind is not equally well suited to the publication it has eventually found. The very long abstracts of such Platonic dialogues as the *Gorgias*, the *Philebus*, the *Republic* (part), though of course excellently done, hardly justify publication, when Balliol has already given us Jowett's similar analyses, not to mention the other books we have, such as Grote's *Plato*, which contain the same matter. Nettleship's work, for instance the essay of unusual length in *Hellenica*, had perhaps a tendency to diffuseness, and I am not sure whether the editors were right in restoring to this paper on *the Good* passages which, they tell us, the author himself had excised.

It is natural to compare Nettleship's paper with Mr. Shorey's study, *The Idea of Good in Plato's Republic* (Chicago, 1895). The two studies have much in common, and their explanation of Plato's meaning is, if I understand them rightly, to a large extent the same. Mr. Shorey writes that 'as "the good of them," the purpose, the *ἔργον*, or the type is the chief cause of things in both the physical and the moral world, so it is their best explanation': and again that the Idea of Good is 'a rational, consistent conception of the greatest possible attainable human happiness, of the ultimate laws of God, nature, or man that sanction conduct, and of the consistent application of these laws in legislation, government, and education.' Nettleship puts it that 'to discover the truth of things is to discover their reason, that is, to see them in their true order and relations. And that which determines their order and relations is always some form of "good"' (p. 362), and (p. 363) the highest function of education is to supply man with an adequate object in 'the ultimate Good or reason of the world,' while 'the dictates of law and morality, if pressed for their final justification, lead to the conception of the same ultimate Good.' I think mature scholars will hold Mr. Shorey's paper somewhat the more valuable of the two, but the difference of conditions and aim must be borne in mind.

The lectures on that great Oxford book, the *Republic*, filling the whole of the second volume, seem to me to deserve very high praise. They do not deal at all with the Greek text, nor is there any display of Platonic erudition or dialectical skill in citation of illustrative matter and in statement and discussion of various views. They are put together, we are informed,

from the notes of pupils, not from MSS. of Nettleship's own; it may be presumed, however, that these topics were not handled by him. But as a clear, sympathetic, skilful, and in a sense complete exposition, with some criticism added, of all the chief contents of the *Republic*, the lectures are admirable. No topic of importance is passed over, and, though one may not concur in every point of interpretation, it is an excellent piece of work. In this volume, which might well be published separately at a lower price, the teaching of the *Republic* is set forth in a way quite sufficient for most readers and intelligible to almost all. Not that it is at all 'popular' in the common sense of the word. It is thoroughly scholarly and requires close attention, but it has none of the wilful or careless obscurity that often renders such writing difficult and even unintelligible. Nettleship always knew what he meant and knew how to say it. If he was always careful about committing himself, it was at any rate not to obscurity that he had recourse. Thus his comments on the more difficult parts of the treatise from the later pages of Book V. to the end of VII. will be found of great assistance to the student. He is, by the way, when he makes the 'ignorance' which is correlative to not-being, as knowledge is correlative to being, simply 'blankness of the mind,' surely more in the right than Mr. Lutoslawski, who in his recent and most valuable book on the logic of Plato says that 'ignorance' here is identical with wrong opinion. But on the vexed question of the exact difference between the 'justice' and 'temperance' of the *Republic* I cannot think he has made everything clear by explaining justice as a sense of duty.

The editors have done very skilfully their really difficult task of putting these lectures together from various people's notes taken in various years. It is Mr. Benson who seems mainly to have undertaken this part of the work, and he is entitled to great praise for the way in which he has carried it out, not least for the exclusion of those repetitions which are not only unavoidable but often actually desirable in oral teaching. He has added a very few notes of his own, in one of which he seems to me to have fallen into an odd error. When Socrates speaks to Glaucon (534 D) of *τοὺς αὐτοῦ παῖδας οὓς τῷ λόγῳ τρέφεις τε καὶ παιδεύεις*, he does not mean Glaucon's actual sons as Mr. Benson seems to take it (p. 289) but his spiritual children, the 'airy burgomasters' of the ideal state. The translation of

τὰναγκαῖα δίκαια καλοῖ καὶ κακά (493 C) by 'can only say that the just and good are the necessary' (p. 206 note) seems to be Nettleship's, and is somewhat misleading. More serious are two misunderstandings of the Greek in the famous Theaetetus passage (176 A foll.) quoted at the end of Vol. I. The subject of συγχωρεῖν in 176 D is 'we,' not the man spoken of; in 177 A the meaning is that impure souls after death will not

gain admission to the 'pure region,' but by reincarnation or otherwise will still, as in the *Phaedo*, haunt this unclean and evil earth, living as they did before. Both Nettleship and Jowett seem to take the time of this haunting to be before death, not after it; but perhaps their views are not quite clear.

H. RICHARDS.

#### HEADLAM'S EDITION OF THE *MEDEA*.

*Euripidis Medea*, edited with introduction and notes by C. E. S. HEADLAM, M.A. Pp. i.-xxv. 1-124. Pitt Press Series. 2s. 6d.

THERE is a freshness and originality about this edition of the *Medea* which makes it pleasant reading. The editor is not a mere compiler. In dealing with the many difficult passages which occur in this play, he has exercised his own judgment, and put forward his own views clearly and concisely, but without dogmatism, and with due deference to the opinions of others. The text is very conservative. The editor seems unwilling to accept an emendation, and he retains and defends the MSS. reading in several passages (137, 160, 843, 851, 1053) where the text is usually considered corrupt, and emendation necessary.

Line 30. ἦν μὴ is retained, and defended as a colloquialism. 45. Καλλίνικον οἶσεται is translated 'win a prize of success.' Neither of the passages quoted justifies this use of καλλίνικον without the article as a noun, and to take καλλίνικον with ἔχθραν, as Mr. Verrall does, is better.

106. In this difficult passage Mr. H. puts a full stop at οἰμωγῆς, and gives as a literal rendering 'plain it is that from a beginning is gathering a cloud of lamentation: I fear that presently she will make it blaze with access of rage.' νέφος οἰμωγῆς is defended by ὀφρύων νέφος (Hippol 173) and by πολέμου νέφος. στεναγμῶν νέφος in Herc. Fur. 1140 might also be quoted.

137. ἐπεὶ μοι φίλον (sc. δῶμα) κέκρανται. The scholiast's explanation of κέκρανται, τετέλεσται ὅλον ὑπάρχει is adopted. The sense is good, but the meaning of κέκρανται more than doubtful.

160. ὦ μεγάλα Θεμι καὶ πότνι Ἄρτεμι. The editor keeps the MSS. reading, and thinks

Artemis is appealed to 'with special reference to her magical aid in the domain of love.' The difficulty which arises from the nurse's mention of Zeus in 168 is got over by supposing that she inaccurately reports the words of Medea, and misses the significance of the appeal to Artemis. This explanation is certainly ingenious, but not quite convincing. The reply of the nurse is strongly in favour of Munro's conjecture καὶ πόσις ἄρτι με, and may it not be urged against retaining πότνι Ἄρτεμι, that Medea would have appealed to the goddess under the name of Hekate, not Artemis, as it is under that name she appears as patroness of spells, cf. 395.

209. νύχιον is well defended by the remark that 'a night voyage was a daring feat, and implies desperate effort to elude pursuit.'

215-18 is a well-known crux. Mr. H. reads δύσνοιαν, τοὺς ἐν θυραίοις, and ῥαθυμίαν, and translates 'I know that many people by a reserved demeanour get a reputation for sourness or slothful indifference—some who appear in public because men judge them by the eye.' It seems simplest to translate τοὺς μὲν ὀμμάτων ἄπο—'Some through the fault of their eyes,' as Mr. Verrall does in his school edition. No edition at hand points out that Ennius and Cicero seem to take ἐξῆλθον δόμων as meaning 'I left my father's home in Colchis,' or that it is possible to take σεμνούς in a good sense: 'I know many who have (left their country and gained) high respect.' In this connection I would refer to a note on Cicero *Fam.* vii. 6 in *Hermathena* vol. v. where this passage of the *Medea* is discussed.

305. εἰμὶ δ' οὐκ ἄγαν σοφῇ. The MSS. reading is kept and translated 'others again find me disagreeable nor do I seem to them particularly wise.' If the clause is so very closely connected with what goes before the

stop before *εἰμί* should be omitted. It is better, however, to keep the stop. Medea is here attempting to disarm Creon of his suspicions. In 303 she admits she is σοφή, here she denies she is ἄγαν σοφή. 'But in spite of the different opinions people form about me I am not so very wise.' This rendering gives more force to δέ.

841. Mr. H. defends the MSS. reading which is usually considered corrupt. He refers πόλις to Athens, and χώρα to Attica. A comma is placed at ὁσίαν, and the difficult μετ' ἄλλων is treated as a prolepsis and translated 'to associate with others.'

852. τέκνων of the MSS. is defended as an obj. gen. dependent on the idea of the clause χειρὶ...τόλμαν. In spite of Mr. H.'s ingenious defence of this view, it is hard to accept it.

905. In this difficult line the ingenious conjecture of Mr. Walter Headlam is adopted γάμον παρεμπολὼντ' ἐπεισάκτους πόσιν. ἐπεισάκτους is an excellent word, but it is hard to see why it was ousted by ἀλλοίους, which however has no meaning here unless it can mean 'wrong,' i.e. different from right.

1053. The MSS. reading ἐκεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν ζῶντες usually considered corrupt is retained, and defended by translating 'In the land of exile they will cheer thee, if they continue alive with me,' i.e. as I continue. μεθ' ἡμῶν is compared with μητρὸς μέτα in 892 'as your mother does.'

1104. οὕτως is read, but the translation of φροῦδος 'the children's spirit of Life

vanishes to the world below,' calls for some remark. φροῦδος means 'gone,' 'vanished,' i.e. has the meaning of a perfect tense. Here it may be compared with the use of a perf. for a future, cf. Soph. Philoct. 75.

1216. ποθεὶν δακρύουσι συμφορὰ is read, and explained as ποθοῦσα δάκρυα συμφορὰ, a poetical inversion. But as ποθεῖνός is always passive, with δακρύουσι it could only mean 'desired,' i.e. followed by tears as L. and S. translate. This is so harsh that few will accept it.

In the very corrupt passage 1263-5 only one change is adopted πίτνει τ' ἐπὶ for πιτνουντ' ἐπὶ. Mr. H.'s translation of the passage makes good sense in English, but it is hard to see how it is derived from the Greek.

In a second edition, if the editor would add notes on the following lines he would make his book still more useful. On 228 the reading γινώσκειν καλῶς for which the editor reads γινώσκω, might be mentioned, and a longer note on σωπηλὸς σοφός (320) would be useful. Attention might be called to the quotation in 522. A note might be added on εὐδαιμονοίτην (1068) as contrasted with the reading εὐδαιμονοῖτον.

1293. The construction of γῆς and κρυφθῆναι should be noticed. There is no note on the metrical irregularity in 1393. It remains to add that there is an excellent introduction, and a copious index.

W. E. P. COTTER.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### AN UNKNOWN MS. OF THE *AGRICOLA* OF TACITUS.

THE following note is from a dissertation by Dr. R. Wuensch on various MSS. of the *Germania* in Hermes xxxii. (1897) p. 59.

'Nach Abfassung dieser Zeilen hatte ich Gelegenheit, eine Germania-Handschrift der Capitular-Bibliothek von Toledo einzusehen, ueber deren Vorhandensein Herr Oberbibliothekar Dr. A. Holder mich gütigst belehrt hatte. Sie ist signiert num. 49, 2, geschrieben 1468—1474 von M. Angelus Tuders, Stadtschreiber von Foligno, und enthält ausser der Germania...den *Agricola* und einige Plinius-briefe. Einen besonderen Werth scheinen die Lesarten dieser Handschrift nicht zu haben.'

Editors of the *Germania* may probably be

justified in thus summarily dismissing this MS.; but to other students of Tacitus by far the most important fact is that it also contains the *Agricola*. Of this treatise only two MSS. are known, both of very late date, and traceable to some one wholly unknown original, and the existence of any third MS. of certainly not later date than these is a very interesting discovery. As the announcement does not seem to have been hitherto noticed, it is well here to direct attention to it, in the hope that some scholar may find an opportunity of giving us a full collation of this portion of the MS.

H. FURNEAUX.



## LEOPARDI'S ODE ON THE MONUMENT OF DANTE AT FLORENCE.

The following version was made in connection with the Italian celebration of the hundredth anniversary of Leopardi's birth at Recanati (June 29, 1898) and privately printed. Professor Jebb's permission has been obtained for its publication in the *Classical Review*: and the subjoined brief summary is taken from the prefatory note to the private issue of the translation.

The sequence of topics may be shown in outline as follows (the two principal parts of the ode being denoted by I. and II.):—

I. Verses 1—17. Italy should honour her great sons who are gone; she has none such left now.

18—34. The deep reproach that Dante has no memorial on Tuscan soil.

35—73. The praise of those who are preparing to remove that reproach.

74—102. Apostrophe to Dante. If he is conscious of these destined honours, he values them, not as done to himself, but for the spur which they may give to the spirit of his country, now fallen so low.

II. 103—136. And happy indeed was Dante to have died before Italy became a prey to foreign invaders.

137—170. The piteous fate of the Italians who perished in Napoleon's Russian campaign.

171—187. Will no one arise to rescue the fatherland of Dante from these miseries?

188—200. If the memories and monuments of Italy can no more rouse her sons, then let them pass out of the land, and leave it desolate for ever.

SOPRA IL MONUMENTO DI DANTE  
CHE SI PREPARAVA IN FIRENZE.

Perchè le nostre genti  
Pace sotto le bianche ali raccolga,  
Non fien da' lacci sciolte  
Dell' antico sopor l' itale menti  
5 S' ai patrii esempi della prisca etade  
Questa terra fatal non si rivolga.  
O Italia, a cor ti stia  
Far ai passati onor; chè d' altrettali  
Oggi vedove son le tue contrade,  
10 Nè v' è chi d' onorar ti si convegna.  
Volgiti indietro, e guarda, o patria mia,  
Quella schiera infinita d' immortali,  
E piangi e di te stessa ti disdegna;  
Chè senza sdegno omai la doglia è  
stolta:  
15 Volgiti e ti vergogna e ti riscuoti,  
E ti punge una volta  
Pensier degli avi nostri e de' nepoti.  
D' aria e d' ingegno e di parlar  
diverso

ΤΟΙΣ ΠΑΡΑΣΚΕΥΑΖΟΜΕΝΟΙΣ  
ΤΟ ΕΝ ΦΛΩΠΕΝΤΙΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΔΑΝΤΕ  
ΜΝΗΜΕΙΟΝ.

Γὰν μὲν Εἰρήνην πτερύγεσιν ὑπαὶ λευκαῖς  
ἔχει σπρ. α'  
τάνδ'· ἀλλὰ πῶς ῥήξαισα πανώλεος ὕπνου  
δεσμὰ πατρὶς τὰς χρονίας ἀφάτας εὐχαιτο  
κεν ἐξαναδύμεν,  
τῶν πάλαι εὐδοκίμων εἰ μὴ πάλιν  
5 μαμοσύναν πατέρων  
ἀνεγείροι, μορσίμῳ  
συμφορᾷ κεκραμένα;  
  
τὴν μεριμᾶν, Ἰταλία, κορυφὰν τάνδ'  
ἐννέπω, ἀντ. α'  
τιμὰς νέμειν τοῖς οἰχομένοισι δικαίως·  
10 οὐ γὰρ ἀνδρας τοῖσι πρὶν ἀντιπάλους ταῖς  
σαῖς ἔθ' ὅρας ἐν ἀρούραις,  
οὐδὲ τῶν τιν' ἐπαίνων ἄξιον.  
ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοὺς φθιμένους  
ἀπὸ τῶν νῦν ἔμπαλιν  
τρέψον, ὦ πάτερ, νόον·  
  
15 κείνων δ' ἀπέραντον ἰδοῖς ἴλαν, ὅσοις  
ἐπ. α'  
κῶδος ἀγήραον ἀνθεῖ, δάκρυσι δευομένα  
γνώθι τάλαν' ἢν' ἀτιμίας μόλες·  
νῦν γὰρ ἀνωφελὲς ἄλγος,  
ᾧ τινι μὴ κέαρ αἰσχύνας ἅμα κέντρον  
ἐπέιγῃ·  
20 κείσε βλέποισα κατασχόνον τε καὶ ὄρσο,  
διδαχθεῖς εἰσάπαξ  
ἀλὶκ' ἔργ' ἀραμένων προγόνων  
οἷαν ἐπαίδευσας σποράν.

- Per lo toscano suol cercando gia  
 20 L' ospite desioso  
 Dove giaccia colui per lo cui verso  
 Il meonio cantor non è più solo.  
 Ed, oh vergogna! udia  
 Che non che il cener freddo e l' ossa  
 nude  
 25 Giaccian esuli ancora  
 Dopo il funereo dì sott' altro suolo,  
 Ma non sorgea dentro a tue mura un  
 sasso,  
 Firenze, a quello per la cui virtude  
 Tutto il mondo t' onora.  
 30 Oh voi pietosi onde sì tristo e basso  
 Obbrobrio laverà nostro paese!  
 Bell' opra hai tolta e di che amor ti  
 rende,  
 Schiera prode e cortese,  
 Qualunque petto amor d' Italia accende.  
 35 Amor d' Italia, o cari,  
 Amor di questa misera vi sproni,  
 Vêr cui pietade è morta  
 In ogni petto omai, perciò che amari  
 Giorni dopo il seren dato n' ha il cielo.  
 40 Spirti v' aggiunga e vostra opra coroni  
 Misericordia, o figli,  
 E duolo e sdegno di cotanto affanno  
 Onde bagna costei le guance e il velo.  
 Ma voi di quale ornar parola o canto  
 45 Si debbe, a cui non pur cure o consigli,  
 Ma dell' ingegno e della man daranno  
 I sensi e le virtudi eterno vanto  
 Oprate e mostre nella dolce impresa?  
 Quali a voi note invio, sì che nel core,  
 50 Sì che nell' alma accesa  
 Nova favilla indurre abbian valore?  
 Voi spirerà l' altissimo subbietto,

- πατρίδων μὲν παντοδαπῶν ἀπο δεῦρ' ὁρμώ-  
 μένοι στρ. β'  
 25 ξείνοι, τρόπον τ' αὐδάν τ' ἀνόμοιοι, αἰδοῦν  
 σᾶμα εὐζήνεται, πόθι νιν κατέχει Τυρσανίδος  
 εὐκλεῆς αἶας,  
 οὐ σοφίας χάριν αἰδοιστάτας  
 οὐκέτι Χίος ἀνὴρ  
 ἐπέων ἐν τέκτοσιν  
 χωρὶς ἦσται γειτόνων.  
 30 τοὶ δὲ πεύθονται λόγον ὃ πόποι αἰσχιστον  
 κλύειν, ἀντ. β'  
 ὥς ἐν ξέῃα ψυχρὰ κόνις ὅστέα τ' ἀνδρὸς  
 γυμνὰ κείνον κατὰ μένει, φυγάδος πάτρας  
 ἀπάνευθε ταφέντος,  
 οὐδὲ τι Φοι κτίσας, ὃ Φλωρεντία,  
 μνάμα, δι' οὐ μεγάλην  
 35 ἀρετὰν αὐτὰ πρέπεις  
 πᾶσιν ἐνδοξος βροτοῖς.  
 ὃ κτησάμενοι πραπίδων ἐξαίρετον ἐπ. β'  
 εὐσεβίαν, χάριν ὧν κηλίδος ἐτι στυγεράς  
 νίψεται ἅδε μελαμπαγὲς μύσος  
 40 χθὼν ὁσίοισι καθαρμοῖς,  
 ἔργματος ἵστε καλοῦ θέντες βάθρον, αἰδού-  
 φρον ἴλα,  
 φροντίδος οἶον ἀπ' εὐψύχου παρὰ πᾶσιν  
 ἐπαίνου τεύξεται,  
 οἷς γ' ἐνὶ στήθεσιν Ἰταλίας  
 μὴ πᾶς κατέσβαχ' ἡμερος.  
 45 ἡμε δ', ὃ γενναϊότατοι, τόδ' ἐπ' ἔργμ'  
 ὥρμαμένους στρ. γ'  
 στέργηθρα γᾶς παμπειθεία τᾶσδ' ἐποτρύνει  
 τὰς ἀγαν δυσδαίμονος, ἃς σέβας ἤδη πᾶσι  
 φρονῶν ἀπόλωλεν,  
 ἀνίκα τὰς προτέρας ἐξ εὐδίας  
 κλαρονόμους ἀχέων  
 50 πόρε δαίμων ἀμέρας  
 ματρὸς ὧν νιοὶ χάριν  
 τᾶσδε κοινὰν πάντες ὁμόφρονος ἐν βουλᾷς  
 ἀκμῇ ἀντ. γ'  
 τολμᾶτε τοῦδ' ἔργου κορυφαῖς ἐπιβάμεν,  
 πατρίδος δ', οἷα συνένευσσε, νεμεσισάθητ'  
 ἐσιδόντες ἀνίαν,  
 55 ἃς καὶ ἕκατι παρειᾶς τ' ἔμπεδον  
 ἃ κακοπομπότατα  
 δακρύων ἄβρᾶς ἄχνα  
 καὶ καλύπτραν τέγγεται.  
 τίς δὴ λόγος ἢ τίς αἰοιδᾷ δαιδάλου ἐπ. γ'  
 60 τέκτονος ἡμῖν πρεπόντως ἀρμόσει, ἄφθιτον  
 οἷς  
 δόξαν ἄγει φιλόφρων τ' εὐβουλία  
 καὶ σύνεσις πολὺμητις  
 χεῖρ θ' ἡμ' ἀριστύπων λαμπρὰ τε καλὸν  
 φύσις οἶμον  
 ἱεμένα; τίνα πέμπων ἡμῖν μεγασθενέος  
 Φοῖβον νόμον

- Ed acri punte premeravvi al seno.  
 Chi dirà l' onda e il turbo  
 55 Del furor vostro e dell' immenso  
     affetto?  
 Chi pingerà l' attonito sembante?  
 Chi degli occhi il baleno?  
 Qual può voce mortal celeste cosa  
 Agguagliar figurando?  
 60 Lunge sia, lunge alma profana. Oh  
     quante  
 Lacrime al nobil sasso Italia serba!  
 Come cadrà? come dal tempo rósa  
 Fia vostra gloria o quando?  
 Voi, di che il nostro mal si disacerba,  
 65 Sempre vivete, o care arti divine,  
 Conforto a nostra sventurata gente,  
 Fra l' itale ruine  
 Gl' itali pregi a celebrare intende.  
     Ecco voglioso anch' io  
 70 Ad onorar nostra dolente madre  
 Porto quel che mi lice,  
 E mesco all' opra vostra il canto mio,  
 Sedendo u' vostro ferro i marmi avviva.  
 O dell' etrusco metro inclito padre,  
 75 Se di cosa terrena,  
 Se di costei che tanto alto locasti  
 Qualche novella ai vostri lidi arriva,  
 Io so ben che per te gioia non senti,  
 Chè saldi men che cera e men ch' arena,  
 80 Verso la fama che di te lasciasti,  
 Son bronzi e marmi; e dalle nostre  
     menti  
 Se mai cadesti ancor, s' unqua cadrai,  
 Cresca, se crescer può, nostra sciaura,  
 E in sempiterni guai  
 85 Pianga tua stirpe a tutto il mondo  
     oscura

- 65 μείζον ἄρω μένος ἐσσυμένους  
 σπουδάν τ' ἐπιφλέξω φρενῶν;  
 αὐτὸ μὰν ἄρκει χρέος οὐ καὶ ἀγωνίζεσθ'  
     ὑπερστρ. δ'  
 ὥστ' ὀξεία ψυχαῖς ὑπὸ κέντρα δονῆσαι  
 τίς κεν εἴποι κύμα μέγ' ὑμετέρας χεიმῶνά  
     τ' ἀθέσφατον ὁρμᾶς,  
 70 δέργμα τίς ἐνθεν ὅσων τ' ἀστραπᾶς;  
 χρήμα γὰρ οὐράνιον  
 πόθεν ἂν θνατῶν φάτις  
 γαρήνοι; θεῖος δ' ἔρως  
 εἴ τιν' οὗτος μῆδεν ἔθελξε, χοροῦ τοῦδ'  
     ἐκποδῶν ἀντ. δ'  
 75 στᾶμεν προφωνῶ. φεῦ, λίθον ὅσ' ἐπὶ  
     κείνον  
 πένθιμον μέλλει δόσιν Ἰταλία δακρύματα  
 πατρὶς ἐνείκει  
 πῶς θέμις ὕμμι ποτ' ἐκλείπειν κλέος;  
 τίς δὲ περιπλομένων  
     ἐτέων εὐδοξίαν  
 80 τάνδ' ἀμαυρώσει χρόνος;  
 τεχνῶν βασιλειαὶ ἀγακλειτῶν, ὑφ' ἂν,  
     ἐπ. δ'  
 θεσπέσιαι Χάριτες, λωφᾶ πικρὸν ἄμμιν  
     ἄχος,  
 ὕμμι μὲν ἀθάνατος ζωὰ μένει,  
 τλάμοσι φάρμακον ἀστοῖς  
 85 δυστυχίας ἀλεγεινᾶς, αἰ κάκ' ἐς αἰνὰ  
     πεσοίσας  
 Ἰταλίας ἀρετᾶν μνάμαν ἐπεγείρετε τῶν  
     ἐγχωριῶν  
 ματρὶ δ' ἀμὰ γέρας ἀχνυμένα  
 κἀγὼ προσάψαι μῶμενος  
 οἶά γ' ἴσχω δῶρα πάριμι φέρων, ἱμαῖς  
     ἐμᾶν στρ. ε'  
 90 μίξαις ἀοιδᾶν ἐργασίαισι ποθειναῖς,  
 ἀγχίτερμον ναιετάων ἔδος, οὐ καὶ καλλίτεχ  
     νοι τελείουσιν  
 χεῖρες ἀλίγκιον ἐμψύχῳ λίθον.  
 ὦ σοφίας ὕπατον  
     στέφανον δρέψαις πάτερ  
 95 μουσικᾶς Τυρσανίδος,  
 πίστις εἰ κακεῖ τις ἐπιχθονίων, εἰ πατρίδος  
     ἀντ. ε'  
 κείνας ἰκάνει σ' ἂν πολυφάμον ἔθηκας,  
 οὐχ ὑπὲρ σαντοῦ, τόδ' ἴσαμι καλῶς, τιμαῖς  
     ἐπὶ ταῖσδε γέγραθας,  
 εἴ γ' ὁ λέλοιπας ἐν ἀνθρώποις κλέος  
 100 μνάμα βεβαιότερον  
 λιθίνον θ' ἰδρύματος  
 καὶ τύπων χαλκαλάτων  
 τῶσσῃ τετέλεσται, ὅσῃ περ καὶ λίθον  
     ἐπ. ε'  
 ψάμμος ἀφαιρότερον χαλκοῦ τε κηρὸς ἐφν'

- Ma non per te ; per questa ti rallegrì  
 Povera patria tua, s' unqua l' esempio  
 Degli avi e de' parenti  
 Ponga ne' figli sonnacchiosi ed egri
- 90 Tanto valor che un tratto alzino il viso.  
 Ah! da che lungo scempio  
 Vedi afflitta costei, che sì meschina  
 Te salutava allora  
 Che di novo salisti al paradiso !
- 95 Oggi ridotta sì che, a quel che vedi,  
 Fu fortunata allor donna e reina.  
 Tal miseria l' accora  
 Qual tu forse mirando a te non credi.  
 Taccio gli altri nemici e l' altre doglie,
- 100 Ma non la più recente e la più fera,  
 Per cui presso alle soglie  
 Vide la patria tua l' ultima sera.  
 Beato te che il fato  
 A viver non dannò fra tanto orrore ;
- 105 Che non vedesti in braccio  
 L' itala moglie a barbaro soldato ;  
 Non predar, non guastar cittadi e colti  
 L' asta inimica e il peregrin furore ;  
 Non degl' itali ingegni
- 110 Tratte l' opre divine a miseranda  
 Schiavitù oltre l' alpe, e non de' folli  
 Carri impedita la dolente via ;  
 Non gli aspri cenni ed i superbi regni ;  
 Non udisti gli oltraggi e la nefanda
- 115 Voce di libertà che ne schernia  
 Tra il suon delle catene e de' flagelli.  
 Chi non si duol? che non soffrimmo?  
 intatto  
 Che lasciaron quei felli?  
 Qual tempio, quale altare o qual mis-  
 fatto?
- 105 εἰ δ' ἔπεισες σύ ποτ' ἐξ ἅμᾶν φρενῶν  
 ἢ ἐπέσεις ἔτ' ἄτιμος,  
 μείζονα δὴ πόροι ἅμιν, εἴ τιν' ἔχοι, κακὰ  
 δαίμων,  
 σὺν δ' ὀδύναις γένος ἀλλήκτοις τεὸν ἀκλεῆς  
 ἐν θνατοῖς στένοι.  
 σαῖς μὲν οὐ τέρπεται ἀγλαΐαις,  
 οἰκτρὰς δ' ὑπὲρ σᾶς πατρίδος,
- 110 εἴ ποτ' ἄστοι κυδαλίμων προγόνων μεμνα-  
 μένοι  
 ῥαθυμίας ἀλλαξάμενοι σθένος ἀργᾶς  
 κρᾶτ' ἀνορθώσουσι χρόνον γ' ἐπὶ παῦρον.  
 φεῦ· χαλεπαῖς ὅσα λῶβαις  
 δαρὸν ἐλαινομέναν λείσσεις πάτραν,
- 115 ἂ σ', ὅτ' ἐς Ἥλυσίαις  
 μακάρων ἔδρας στόλον  
 ἐστάλης τὸν δεύτερον,  
 οὐκ ἐν ὥρᾳ θήκατ' ἀποιχόμενον· νῦν δ' αὖ  
 κακοῖς ἀντ. 5'  
 ἀλγεῖ τοιούτοις, ὥστε παρ' ἂν σὺ δέδορκα  
 120 ὀλβία δόξαι τᾶς τόθ' ἑκατὶ τύχας χώρᾳ  
 πάρος ἐμβασιλεύσαι·  
 θαυμά κ' ἄπιστον ἴσως κῆθεν δρακεῖς  
 πῆμα τοσόνδε λέγοις.  
 τὰ μὲν ἄλλ' ἐχθροῦς τ' ἀφείς  
 καὶ πόνους σιγάσομαι·
- 125 δεινῶν δ' ὁ νεώτατον ἔχθιστόν θ' ὁμῶς,  
 ἐπ. 5'  
 τοῦτο φράσαιμ' ἂν, ὅφ' οὐ μοίρας ἐπιόντα  
 τεὰ  
 πατρὶς ὅπως τελευταίας ζόφον.  
 ἄξιος εἰ μακαρίζειν,  
 ὃν πότισον οὐ κάθειν λεύσσονθ' Ὑπερίονος  
 αὐγᾶς
- 130 ταῖσδε σύνοικον ἐν αἵταις ἔμμεναι, οὐδ'  
 ἀκολάστους προσβλέπειν  
 ἀγκάλας ἀμφιτιθέντα βία  
 νύμφαισιν αἰχματὰν ξένον  
 Ἱταλαῖς· οὐδ' εἰσίδες ἄστεα καὶ λευροὺς  
 γῆρας στρ. ζ'  
 ὡμὰς βιατᾶν ἀλλοδαπῶν ὑπὸ λύσσης
- 135 δαίτοις ἐν δούρασι περθομένους, ἔργων θ'  
 ὅσ' ὑπέρτατα τέχναις  
 Ἱταλικάι Χάριτες θεαῖαι κάμον  
 ἐλκόμεν' εἰς ὕποχον  
 Βορέᾳ γὰρ, βαρβάρων  
 δεσποτῶν κόσμον δόμοις·
- 140 οὐδ' ἁμαξᾶν πλήρ' ἴδες πικινᾶν λυγρὰν  
 ὀδόν, ἀντ. ζ'  
 ξείνων ὅπ' οὐκ ἄκουσας ἀμείλιχον ἄστοις  
 ἐντολὰς κραίνουσιν ὑπερφιάλους, δούλοις τ'  
 ὄνυμ', ὥσπερ ἐφ' ὕβρει,  
 σεμνὸν Ἑλευθερίας, χειρωμάτων  
 δυσσεβέων πρόφασιν,  
 145 ἀνακαρνηθέν, πεδᾶν  
 ἔν τε μαστίγων ψόφῳ.



120 Perchè venimmo a sì perversi tempi?

Perchè il nascer ne desti o perchè  
prima

Non ne desti il morire,

Acerbo fato? onde a stranieri ed empi

Nostra patria vedendo ancella e schiava

125 E da mordace lima

Roder la sua virtù, di null' aita

E di nullo conforto.

Lo spietato dolor che la stracciava

Ammollir ne fu dato in parte alcuna.

130 Ahi non il sangue nostro e non la vita

Avesti, o cara; e morto

Io non son per la tua cruda fortuna.

Qui l'ira al cor, qui la pietade abbonda:

Pugnò, cadde gran parte anche di noi:

135 Ma per la moribonda

Italia no; per li tiranni suoi.

Padre, se non ti sdegni,

Mutato sei da quel che fosti in terra.

Morian per le rutene

140 Squallide piagge, ahi d' altra morte

degni,

Gl'itali prodi; e lor fea l'aere e il

cielo

E gli uomini e le belve immensa guerra.

Cadeano a squadre a squadre

Semivestiti, maceri e cruenti,

145 Ed era letto agli egri corpi il gelo.

Allor, quando traean l'ultime pene,

Membrando questa desiata madre,

Diceano: oh non le nubi e non i venti,

Ma ne spegnesse il ferro, e per tuo  
bene,

150 O patria nostra. Ecco da te rimoti,

Quando più bella a noi l'età sorride,

A tutto il mondo ignoti,

τίς πένθεος οὐ μετέχει; ποῖον δ' ἄχος  
ἐπ. ζ

οὐ φέρομεν; τί δ' ἀπόρθητον νοέουσιν ἔαν  
οὔδ' ἄνομοι, τί θεῶν ἀνάκτορον

150 ἢ τίνα βωμὸν ὑβρισταί;  
ποῖα κάκ' οὐ τελείουσ'; εἴθ' ὥφελε μή ποθ'  
ικέσθαι

σκαιοσύναν ἐπὶ τοιαύταν γένος ἁμόν· ἰώ,  
ζῶαν τί δή,

πικρὲ δαῖμον, πόρες ἄμυν ἔχειν,  
ἀλλ' οὐ φθάσαις Αἰδὸν τέλος;

155 ἀλλοφύλοις ὧν ἀθέοις ὑπακούουσιν πάτραν,  
στρ. η'

δούλαν τιν' ὥς, ἀστῶν τ' ἀρετὰν ὑπ'  
ἀνάγκας

εἰσροφῶντες τειρομέναν δακεθύμοι, οὔτε τιν'  
ἄμμες ἀρωγὰν

οὔτε παραγορίαν ἔμπας φέρειν

ἄθλιοι ἀρκέσαμεν,

160 ὁδύνας θελκτῆριον  
τῆς διανταίας ἄκος.

ὦ φίλα θρέπτειρα, σέθεν δ' ὑπερ οὐκ ἔτλα  
θανεῖν ἀντ. η'

ψυχὰν τις αἰχμαῖς ἀνδροφόνουσι προτείνων·  
σαῖσι δ' ἐν λῶβαις σῶος εἴμ'. ἐλέτω θυμὸν

χόλος ἥδ' οὐκ οἶκτος,

165 οὐνεκα μαρνάμενοι πλείστοι πέσον

οὐχ ὑπὲρ Ἰταλικᾶς

φθινάδος γῆς Ἰταλοί,

ἀλλὰ τῶν κείνα ζυγόν

ἔχθιστον ἐπ' αὐχένι θέντων. ὦ πάτερ  
ἐπ. η'

170 ἁμετέρων μέγ' αἰοιδῶν ἔξοχε, ταῦτ' ἐπιδῶν  
εἰ σὺ χόλῳ φρένα μὴ δάκνει, φύσιν

ἢ ῥα νέαν μεταμεῖψαι

φαμί σε τῆς προτέρας ἂν ζωὸς ἐὼν ποτ'  
ἔφαινες·

τηλεπόρου γὰρ ἀπώλοντο Σκυθίας καθ'  
ὁδοὺς δυσστερπείας

175 Ἰταλῶν φέρτατοι, οὗ τι τύχας,  
αἰαί, τοιαύτας ἄξιοι·

τοῖς ἁμᾶ δυσχείμερος ἄλγεα πόρσυν'  
οὐρανός, στρ. θ'

ἀνδρῶν δ' ἁμᾶ θηρῶν τ' ἀπερείσιος ὕβρις·  
ἡμίγυνοι δ' ὥς χαμαὶ ἰσχνὰ μέλη, χραν-

θέντα φοναῖσι, κατ' Ἰλας

180 θέσσαν, ὑπὴν νοσεροῖς πᾶχνα λέχος.

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ σφιν ἄγεν

Ἀἰδὰς τέρμ' ἔσχατον,

φιλτάτας μεμναμένοι

ματρὸς εἶπον· φεῦ, τί κελαINEφένων πορθοῦ-  
μενοι ἀντ. θ'

185 πλαγαῖς θελλῶν θνάσκομεν, οἷσι προ-  
σῆκεν,

Moriam per quella gente che t' uccide.

Di lor querela il boreal deserto

155 E conscie fur le sibilanti selve.

Così vennero al passo,

E i negletti cadaveri all' aperto

Su per quello di neve orrido mare

Dilacerâr le belve ;

160 E sarà il nome degli egregi e forti

Pari mai sempre ed uno

Con quel de' tardi e vili. Anime care,

Bench' infinita sia vostra sciagura,

Datevi pace ; e questo vi conforti

165 Che conforto nessuno

Avrete in questa o nell' età futura.

In seno al vostro smisurato affanno

Posate, o di costei veraci figli,

Al cui supremo danno

170 Il vostro solo è tal che s' assomigli.

Di voi già non si lagna

La patria vostra, ma di chi vi spinse

A pagnar contra lei,

Sì ch' ella sempre amaramente piagna

175 E il suo col vostro lacrimar confonda.

O di costei ch' ogni altra gloria vinse

Pietà nascesse in core

A tal de' suoi ch' affaticata e lenta

Di sì buia vorago e sì profonda

180 La ritraesse ! O glorioso spirito,

Dimmi : d' Italia tua morto è l' amore ?

Dì : quella fiamma che t' accese, è  
spenta ?

Dì : nè più mai rinverdirà quel mirto

Ch' alleggiò per gran tempo il nostro  
male ?

185 Nostre corone al suol fien tutte sparte ?

Nè sorgerà mai tale

Che ti rassembri in qualsivoglia parte ?

ὦ πάτρα, σοῦ καδομένοισι πεσεῖν χάρμαις  
ἐνὶ κυδιανείραις ;  
νῦν δ', ἐρατώπις ὅτ' αἰὼν προσγελά,  
φθειρόμεθ' οἶδε σέθεν  
δίχα, παντὰ νόνημοι,  
190 σὼν ὑπὲρ λυμαντόρων.

τοιαῦτ' ὀλοφυρομένων κρυσταλλοπαῖς  
ἐπ. θ'

αἶε γαῖα λιγύφθογοί τ' ἀνέμοισι νάπαι.  
τάνδε βίον μὲν ἀπαλλαγὰν λάχον·  
σώματα δ' οἰκτρὰ θανόντων  
195 ἄμ πεδίων χιονοβλήτους πλάκας ὀκρυόε-  
σας  
δάπτον ὑπαίθρια θῆρες· δόξα δ' ἴσα τὸν  
ἔπειτ' αἰεὶ χρόνον  
τοῖσι λαμπροῖς ἀγαθοῖς θ' ἔπεται,  
δειλοὶ θ' ὁμοίως εἰ τινες

ἦσαν αὐτῶν καὶ κακοί. ὦ μεγαλὰν δὴ  
συμφορὰν στρ. ι'  
200 κύρσαντες ἔμπας στέργετε· πῆμασι δ'  
εἴπερ  
μήτε νῦν μήτ' εἰσοπίσω ποτὲ παιὼν ἡμε-  
τέροισι πελάσσει,  
τλάτε τόδ' αὐτὸ μαθόντες καρτερεῖν.  
σῖγα τρέφοντες ἄχος  
ἀνέχεσθ' ἐξαισίον,  
205 γνήσι' ὦ τέκν' ἀθλίας

ματρός, ἧ πάντων ὑπάτοισι δαμασθείσα  
πάνοις ἀντ. ι'  
οὐκ ἔστι πλὴν ἡμῶν ὅς ὁμοῖα πέπονθεν.  
οὐ γὰρ ἡμῖν μέμφεται Ἰταλία, κείνῳ δ' ὅς  
ἐπῶρσ' ἀέκοντας  
πατρὶδι δύσθεος ἀντάραι μάχαν·  
210 ὣν ἔνεκ' ἀχθομένα  
δρόσον αἰεὶ δακρύων  
ἡμμι κοινὰν εἴβεται.

πῶς ἂν πολυπήμονος αἰδῶ πατρίδος ἐπ. ι'  
τὰς πρὶν ὑπείροχον ἄλλων κῦδος ἀειραμένας  
215 ἐν πραπίδεσσι λάβοι τις ἐκγόνων,  
ὅς κ' ἐρύσαιτο κλυδωνος  
ἐκ μέλανος βαθυδίνου τριβομένην καμὰ-  
τοισιν ;  
εἰπέ μοι, ὦ μακάρων τιμαῖσιν ἀοιδὲ μιγείς  
ὑψιθρόνοις,  
ἄρα σᾶς οἴχεται Ἰταλίας  
220 πρόρριζος ἐκ θνατῶν ἔρως ;

ἄρ' ἀπέσβακ' ἔνθεος ἧ σὲ κατεῖχ' ὄρμᾳ  
φρενῶν, στρ. κ'  
οὐδ' αὖθις ἡμᾶν, ὥς τὸ πάροιθ', ὀδυνῶν  
μαλθακὸν κούφισμα φέροις· ἀναβαλήσει  
ποτ' ἐν ἀνδράσι μῦθος ;  
ἄρα χαμαιπετέων ἄμμι φθίνει  
225 πᾶσα χάρις στεφάνων,  
παρόμοιον δ' οὐδαμοῦ  
σοὶ τιν' αὐθρέψει πατρίς ;

In eterno perimmo? e il nostro  
scorno  
Non ha verun confine?  
190 Io mentre viva andrò scclamando in-  
torno:  
Volgiti agli avi tuoi, guasto legnaggio;  
Mira queste ruine  
E le carte e le tele e i marmi e i  
templi;  
Pensa qual terra premi; e se destarti  
195 Non può la luce di cotanti esempi,  
Che stai? levati e parti.  
Non si conviene a sì corrotta usanza  
Questa d' animi eccelsi altrice e scola:  
Se di codardi è stanza,  
200 Meglio l' è rimaner vedova e sola.

ἦ ῥ' ἔσαι κείμεθα; μέτρον ἄρ' οὐκ ἔσται  
ψόγον; ἀντ. κ'  
ζῶας ἔγωγ' ἔστ' ἂν μετέχω, τάδε παντῇ  
230 πᾶσι καρύξω· προγόνων ἀρετὰς μνάσασθε,  
γένος πολλὸν χεῖρον·  
λείψαν' ὁρᾶτε τὰδ' ὧν κείνοι κάμον,  
Περιδὼν τ' ἐρατὰν  
μελέτας ἰστών θ' ὑφ' αὖς  
ἔργα τ' εὐμόρφων λίθων  
235 ναοὺς τε θεῶν· χθονὸς ἴσθ' οἷας πέδον  
ἐπ. κ  
στείβετε· κυδαλίμων δ' εἰ πᾶν φάος ἐκ  
πατέρων  
ὑμῖ μᾶταν κέχεται, ποῦ χρὴ μένειν;  
ἐκτοποι ἔρρετε γαίᾳ·  
οὐ γὰρ ἔοικεν ἀνάνδροις θρέμμασι πατρίδ'  
ὁμιλεῖν  
240 ἃ μεγαλόφρονα παίδευσ'· εἰ δὲ γενήσεται  
ἀψύχων λιμήν,  
κρέσσον' αἰσάν κε λαχούσα πέλοι  
χῆρα τ' ἐρήμα τ' εἰσαεῖ.

R. C. JEBB.

## ARCHAEOLOGY.

## NOTE ON CYPRIOTE POTTERY.

M. E. POTTIER, to whose *Catalogue des Vases Antiques de Terre-cuite du Louvre* students of ancient pottery owe so many valuable observations, has been good enough to call my attention to a passage in my paper on 'Excavations in Cyprus in 1894,' (*J.H.S.* xvii. 153), in which I have inadvertently mis-stated his views as to the date of two classes of Cypriote pottery.

First, I failed to state expressly, in the passage referred to, that the 'red-ware' to which I alluded is not the *handmade* 'red-ware,' which M. Pottier rightly assigns to the pre-Mykenaeen period (*Catalogue*, p. 84, No. A 24. 27. *Album*, Pl. 5 (=A 24. 27), but, as I thought might be inferred from the context, the Graeco-Phoenician *wheel-made* redware, such as *Catalogue*, p. 112, No. A 166-175: *Album*, Pl. 9 (=A 167), which does disappear, as I stated, in the eighth century or soon after, with the exception of certain local fabrics, (such as *Catalogue*, p. 111, No. A 165. *Album*, Pl. 9) which M. Pottier is wholly justified in regarding as having persisted into the period when Attic fabrics of sixth and fifth century styles were being imported into Cyprus.

These fabrics, however, are easily distinguished from the purely Cypriote style, which, so far from being the 'perfectionnement de la fabrique à ton rouge,' (*Cat.* p.

112, = A 166-175) or indicating 'une époque assez récente ou l'on chercher à imiter le beau brillant des vases grecs du vi<sup>e</sup> et du v<sup>e</sup> siècle,' had entirely gone out of use, at a period not much later than that of the Proto-Corinthian vases with 'running dogs' upon them, which are the only Hellenic fabric which occurs in the same tombs with them.

Secondly, with regard to the 'Cypriote bucchero,' I stated (*J.H.S.* xvii. p. 153) that this 'begins in the Mykenaeen Age, and disappears earlier than the fibulae'—*i.e.* in the eighth century or a little later;—and I observed that M. Pottier regarded them as a Hellenistic fabric; for he describes his 'quatrième période,' under which heading he classes this fabric, (p. 116) as 'allant du v<sup>e</sup> siècle à l' époque gréco-romaine' (*Catalogue*, p. 102). M. Pottier points out to me that he had himself contemplated the possibility of an earlier date, in a phrase which I confess that I overlooked, and which I take this opportunity, with his permission, of quoting in full.

D. *Quatrième période* (çi-dessus p. 102).

253-255. 'Je place ici quelques spécimens d'une catégorie toute particulière; ce sont les vases imitant la technique du métal dont deux (253, 254) pourraient appartenir à une époque ancienne si l'on en juge d'après la gaucherie du façonnage, la rudesse de la

terre; mais il n'est pas toujours facile de dire si l'aspect grossier d'une poterie est dû à une haute antiquité ou à une exécution négligée. On peut les comparer à certains vases italiotes d'argile noire, imitant par des cannelures l'aspect du métal, et dont la date est relativement récente.

J. L. MYRES.

### MONTHLY RECORD.

*Numismatic Chronicle.* Part i. 1898.

P. Perdrizet. 'Sur un tétradrachme de Nabis. Interesting remarks on the unique coin with the portrait of Nabis published by me in *Num. Chron.* 1897, p. 107; pl. v. 2. ΒΑΙΛΕΟΣ is not an engraver's blunder but is shown to=ΒΑΗΛΕΟΣ the Laconian form of ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ.

Part ii. 1898.

W. Wroth. 'Greek coins acquired by the British Museum in 1897.' 836 Greek coins have been added to the collection, including 20 pieces in gold and electrum and 313 in silver. Among the specimens described are the following:—*Delphi.* A unique didrachm, circ. B.C. 480–450. *obv.* Ram's head. *rev.* Ceiling of temple, with sunk panels. *Tenea* in Achaia. A rare imperial coin, type, Dionysos. *Nicaea.* Imperial, with *rev.* Lion's head radiate, probably the lion of the Zodiac. *Cyzicus.* A fine stater with a bearded head in a conical cap, often called Ulysses, but probably a Cabirus. *Ephesus.* A gold coin probably struck B.C. 87–84. *Erythrae.* Imperial, with reclining river-god, inscribed ΑΛΕΩΝ. This is the 'Aleon fluvius' of Plin. *N.H.* v. 117, elsewhere (xxxii. 14) called by him the Aleos:—'Erythris Aleos amnis pilos gignit in corporibus.' *Rhodes.* A unique gold coin struck B.C. 189? *Hierapolis* in Phrygia. A very fine specimen of an Imperial coin representing the goddess ΕΥΠΟΚΙΑ. *Syedra* in Cilicia. Coin of Salonina, inscribed ΘΕΜΙΚ, with two wrestlers: cp. the agonistic inscriptions of Syedra. *Aegean Islands?* A seventh century didrachm with a toad as type.—S. M. Alisch. 'Posidium in Coele-Syria.' An unpublished silver coin attributed to Posidium.—John Evans. 'A hoard of Roman coins.' 3169 silver coins, Nero to Severus Alexander, said to have been found in the east of England. The coins are Imperial *denarii* and there are numerous specimens of the *argenteus Antoninianus* first struck under Caracalla in A.D. 215.

*Numismatische Zeitschrift* (Vienna). Vol. xxix, for 1897, published 1898.

M. Bahrfeldt. 'Nachträge und Berichtigungen zur Münzkunde der römischen Republik.' Pp. 1–150.

Additions to the coins described in Babelon's *Monnaies de la répub. rom.* (continued).—A. Markl. 'Ein Goldmedaillon von Claudius II.'

*Zeitschrift für Numismatik.* (Berlin). Vol. xxi. Parts 1 and 2. 1898.

H. Dannenberg. 'Alfred von Sallet.' A brief memoir of the late director of the Berlin coin-cabinet, b. 19 July 1842, d. 25 Nov. 1897.—U. Köhler. 'Ueber die attische Goldprägung.' The Athenian gold coinage has been assigned by Head to B.C. 393 and by Babelon to B.C. 407. Köhler maintains that it consists of two classes, (i) struck in B.C. 407 (ii) struck in B.C. 339 and in B.C. 295. The dates assigned by Köhler for his second division may, possibly, be open to question, but there can be little doubt that he is right, on grounds of style, in dividing the Athenian gold coinage into an earlier and a later class.—O. Seeck. 'Zu den Festmünzen Constantius und seiner Familie.'—H. Willers. 'Die Münze Thibron's.' The Θιβρόντων νόμισμα mentioned by Photius appears from a notice in Pollux to have been a false or debased coin. Willers conjectures that it was a bronze coin, plated with silver, struck by the Spartan Harmost Thibron, B.C. 400, for the payment of his troops.—J. E. Kirchner. 'Zur datierung der athenischen Silbermünzen der beiden letzten vorchristlichen Jahrhunderte.' Chiefly notes on the magistrates.—W. Drexler. 'Tantalos auf Münzen von Kyme.'

*Revue Numismatique.* Part ii. 1898.

E. Babelon. 'La collection Waddington...Inventaire sommaire' (continued). Coins of Cilicia, Isauria, Lycaonia and Cyprus.—P. Perdrizet. 'Statère chypriote au nom d'Epipalos.' Apparently a new king of Cyprus, nearly contemporary with the Cypriote Lysandros.—E. Tacchella. 'Monnaies autonomes d'Apollonia de Thrace.' This paper deals with the well-known series of coins with the type anchor and cray-fish. These coins have been attributed to Abydos, to Ankore, to Astacus, and are now generally assigned to Apollonia ad Rhyndacum. Tacchella brings forward some important evidence as to their Thracian provenance and proposes to assign some of them to Apollonia Pontica in Thrace, though he would give other specimens to Abydos.—B. Pick. 'Observations sur les monnaies autonomes d'Apollonia de Thrace.' Pick assigns the whole series of 'anchor' coins to Apollonia Pontica and rightly rejects the attribution to Abydos. On a silver coin now attributed to Apollonia Pontica he sees a reproduction of the colossal Apollo of Kalamis removed by Lucullus from Apollonia to Rome.—M. C. Soutzo. 'Étude sur les monnaies impériales' (continued).—R. Mowat. 'Arnasi.' An inscription found on Roman coins of Trebonianus Gallus and Volusian.

WARWICK WROTH.

### SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

*American Journal of Philology.* Vol. xix, 1. Whole No. 73. April, 1898.

The *Bhārata* and the Great *Bhārata*, E. W. Hopkins. A review of Dahlmann's Mahābhārata. *The Ayer Papyrus: a mathematical fragment*, E. J. Goodspeed. Obtained in Cairo about three years ago. Perhaps a fragment of one of those early mathematical works whose materials Heron of Alexandria organized and compiled. *Semasiological Possibilities*, F. A. Wood. The thesis is that differ-

ence in meaning is of itself no bar to connecting words, because each signification of a word is capable of development. I nunc and i with another imperative, E. B. Lease. A statistical paper giving exx. of these expressions. I nunc denotes emotion and does not appear in prose till Seneca's time, nor does it occur in Plautus or Terence. I with another imper. is much more common in poetry than in prose. In prose it is chiefly found in Livy.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES. Among the books



reviewed are Buecheler's *Anthologia Latina*, Conway's *The Italic Dialects*, Abbott's *Selected Letters of Cicero*, and Moore's *Julius Firmicus Maternus, der Heide und der Christ*. There are Brief Mentions of Dittmar's *Studien zur lateinischen Moduslehre* directed against Prof. Hale's treatise on cum-constructions, and of Starkie's edition of the *Wasps*.

**Revue de Philologie.** Vol. 22. Part 2. April, 1898.

*Le Temple d'Apollon Didyméen.* Questions chronologiques, ii, B. Haussoullier. Other inscriptions explained [Cl. Rev. sup. p. 284]. **APEINOS**, H. Diels. This word in an inscr. of Delos denotes a species of wood. *Julius Paelignus, préfet des vigiles et procureur de Cappadoce*, Ph. Fabia. On Tac. Ann. xii, 49 and Dion Cassius lxi, 6, 6. Identifies the Julius Paelignus of Tac. with Lælianus of Dion l.c. *Alphabets numériques latins*, P. Lejay. On the attempts that have been made to use all the letters of the Latin alphabet as numerals. These alphabets are of two classes (1) the signs of the Agrimensores, and (2) systematic alphabets. *Notes épigraphiques*, B. Haussoullier. On inscr. to Apollo Κπαρεαός, Zeus Κεσσάλλος, and Zeus Έπικάρπιος. *Virgile*, Ecl. i, 5, G. Ramain. Translates 'Tu apprendras à la belle Amaryllis à faire ressonner les bois.' *Sophocle*, Philoct. 32, A. Dauphin. Suggests δ' ένδον ολκος ποίος έντι; τίς τροφή; *Phaeder*, Append. Perott. 8, L. Havet. *Phaedrus* l.c. refers to Varro ap. Plin. N.H. vii, 81 and the Tritannus of Pliny is to be identified with the Trit. of Lucilius ap. Cic. Fin. i, § 9. *Cicero*, Fin. i, §§ 10, 11, 12, 20, 23, 24, L. Havet. *Encore Herodote*, i, 86, M. L. Earle [see Cl. Rev. xi, 174, 369]. *Notes sur Bacchylide*, A. M. Desrousseaux.

Part 3. July, 1898. *De l'orthographe des lapicides carthaginois*, A. Audollent. A contribution towards our knowledge of the pronunciation of popular Latin by the African subjects of Rome. *Le 'Protrepticus' de Galien et l'édition de Jamot* (1883), M. Beaudoin. The ed. of Jamot is derived from the Aldine probably compared with the Basle edition. In most of the corrections the Latin translations of Erasmus and Bellisarius were used. *Cicero*, Fin. i, L. Havet. Various notes critical and exegetical. *L'oracle d'Apollon à Claros*, B. Haussoullier. Five inscriptions explained. *Questions de syntaxe latine*, J. Lebreton. (1) On the use of the tenses in the conditional comparatives (*quasi tamquam* etc.), (2) the use of the reflexive in apposition, and in the complement of the attributive adjective. *Notes sur l'Hippolyte d'Euripide*, E. Chambry. *Dierectus*, G. Ramain. Occurs twelve times in Plaut., once in a frag. of Varro, and once in the abridgment of Festus. It is not a mistake for *derectus* or *directus*. *Encore Hérodote* i, 86, J. Keelhoff [see above]. *Διπόδαρος*, P. Perdrizet. The genuineness of this name in Diod. xviii, 7, 5 defended.

**Rheinisches Museum für Philologie.** Vol. 53, 2. 1898.

*Die Hundekrankheit (κύνων) der Pandareostöchter und andere mythische Krankheiten*, W. H. Roscher. Against Kroll's assumption of the late origin of this myth. An account is given of the chief exx. of

mythological diseases. *Oskisches aus Pompeji*, F. Buecheler. On an inscr. lately discovered at Pompeii. *Studien zu Ciceros Briefen an Atticus*, O. E. Schmidt. Continued from the last vol. [Cl. Rev. xi, 323]. 65 places from books xi-xvi examined. *Der alte Tempel und das Hekatompedon auf der Akropolis zu Athen*, G. Koerte. A polemic against Doerpfeld with an excursus on the Hekatompedon inscription. *Textkritisches zu lateinischen Dichtern*, J. Ziehen. On various fragments chiefly from Riese's *Lateinischer Anthologie*. *Bakchylides' Gedicht auf Pytheas von Aigina*, F. Blass. Does not consider that this ode is at all inferior to Pindar's fifth Nemean and therefore does not believe that on this ground B. was not called on to celebrate the victories of Pytheas' brother Phylakidas. *Der Thukydides-Papyrus von Oxyrhynchos*, J. Steup. From this we know that the text of our MSS. of Thuc. of the middle ages was essentially in existence in the first or second cent. A.D.

**MISCELLAN.** *Varia*, C. Weyman. *Zu Bakchylides* xi, O. Hense. *Zu Bakchylides*, J. M. Stahl. *Die Abfassungszeit von Theophrasts Charakteren*, F. Buchl. No one date can be given. They were probably composed at various times. *Pisanders Athla des Herakles*, E. Woelfflin. In Quint. x, i, 56 we should probably read *athla* for *acta*. *Epigraphisch-Kalendarisches*, E. F. Bischoff.

Part 3. Göttliche Synonyme, H. Usener. *Zur Datierung einiger athenischer Archonten*, J. E. Kirchner. Those treated of here are Damasias, Urios, Sosistratos, Pheidistratos, Andreas, Herodes, Lysandros son of Apolexis, and Architimos. *Das sogenannte Fragment Hygins*, M. Manitius. The text of the *Excerptum de astrologia* [Arati] with critical notes. *Der Kalender im Ptolemäerreich*, M. L. Strack. Concludes that in the kingdom of the Lagidae, during the first half of their rule, there were two Egyptian and two Macedonian years in use. *Ueber den Mynascodez der griechischen Kriegsschriftsteller in der Pariser Nationalbibliothek*, H. Schöne. *Neue platonische Forschungen*. Zweites Stück, i, F. Susemihl. The first part was lately read before the University of Greifswald. This part is on the presentation of the theory of knowledge of the Protagoras in the Theaetetus. *Das ένκάριον εις Πτολεμαίον und die Zeitgeschichte*, H. v. Protz. (1) The cult of the θεοί Σωτήρες, (2) the family relationships, (3) the time of the composition of the poem. This is put 273-1 B.C. *Noch ein Wort zur Topographie Korkyras*, B. Schmidt. A supplement to the writer's *Korkyraeischen Studien*.

**MISCELLAN.** *Coniectanea A. Meinekii inedita*, A. de Mess. *Zu Aristoteles Meteorologie* i, 1, F. Susemihl. *Ueber eine Stelle in der Politik des Aristoteles*, U. Köhler. The passage is Pol. v, 4, 5. *Ein Fragment des Demetrios von Phaleron*, U. Köhler. Found in Plutarch's tractate πότερον 'Αθηναίοι κατά πόλεμον ή κατά σοφίας ένδοξότεροι cap. 5. *Posidoniana*, F. Malchin. An answer to Martini's criticism of the writer's *Quaestiones Posidonianae*. *Zu Suetons Caesares*, M. Ihm. On the archetype of our Suetonius MSS. *ἀρμῶι und ἀρμῶφ*, K. Fuchs. Quotes a passage from pseudo-Hippokrates to show that this word also = 'entirely.'

## LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

### ENGLISH AND AMERICAN BOOKS.

*Aeschylus. Prometheus Vincit*, with introduction, and critical, and explanatory notes by E. E. Sikes and St. J. B. Wynne Wilson. 12mo. 264 pp. Macmillan. 2s. 6d.

*Cicero, pro Marcello*, with introduction, notes, vocabulary, test papers, and translation by T. R. Mills and T. T. Jeffery. Small crown 8vo. 86 pp. (Univ. Tutorial Series.) Clive. 3s.

- Crutwell* (C. T.) History of Roman literature. 6th Edition. 8vo. 522 pp. Griffin. 8s. 6d.
- Demosthenes*. Androton, with introduction and notes edited by T. R. Mills. Crown 8vo. 67 pp. (Univ. Tutorial Series.) Clive. 4s. 6d.
- *Meidias*. Translation and Test Papers by W. J. Woodhouse. Crown 8vo. 68 pp. (Univ. Tutorial Series.) Clive. 3s. 6d.
- Liddell* (A. C.) Latin Grammar Papers. 12mo. 108 pp. Blackie. 1s.
- Ovid*. Metamorphoses, 13th and 14th books, with introduction and notes by C. H. Keene. 4th Edition. 12mo. Bell. 3s. 6d.
- Palladius*. Butler (C.) The Lausiac History of Palladius. (Texts and Studies, Vol. iv, 1.) Crown 8vo. Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.
- Plato*. Bryan (W. L. and Charlotte L.) 'The republic' of Plato; with studies for teachers. 8vo. 10, 316 pp. New York, Scribner. \$1.25.
- Plautus*. Captivi, a translation with Test Papers by F. G. Plaistowe. Crown 8vo. 60 pp. (Univ. Tutorial Series.) Clive. 2s. 6d.
- Sophocles*. Antigone. Close Translation in Metrical English. Founded upon the text and commentary of Prof. Jebb, by C. E. Laurence. Crown 8vo. 48 pp. Simpkin. 1s.
- *Oedipus Coloneus*, a translation with Test Papers by W. H. Balgarnie. Crown 8vo. 56 pp. (Univ. Tutorial Series.) Clive. 3s. 6d.
- Xenophon*. Hellenics, Books I-III. Literally translated by Roscoe Mongan. 12mo. Cornish. 2s. 6d.

## FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Aeschylus Agamemnon, cum annotatione critica et commentario ed. F. H. M. Blaydes. 8vo. xv, 392 pp. Halle, Waisenhaus. 8 Mk.
- Ammianus Marcellinus. Schickinger (H.) Die Gracismen bei Ammianus Marcellinus. 8vo. 17 pp. Nikolsburg.
- Apuleius. Korompay (G.) Die Märchenallegorie des Apulejus 'De Psyche et Cupidine' nebst einem Anhang über Ursprung, Alter, Composition und Bedeutung derselben. 8vo. 16 pp. Teschen.
- Aristoteles. Πολυκρεία 'Aðynala', tertium ed. G. Kaibel et U. de Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. 8vo. xvii, 98 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 1 Mk. 80.
- Duprat (G. L.) Quomodo apud Aristotelem in ejus de anima doctrina Empedocles et Hippocrates auctoritate contenderint cum Platone. 8vo. 64 pp. Paris.
- Vahlen (J.) Hermeneutische Bemerkungen zu Aristoteles' Poetik. 8vo. 20 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 1 Mk.
- (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der k. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften.')
- Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca, edita consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae. Vol. II. Pars III. Alexandri quod fertur in Aristotelis Sophisticos elenchos commentarium, ed. Max. Wallies. 8vo. xxxii, 238 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 10 Mk.
- Athenaeus. Meyer (J.) Spicilegium emendationum et observationum in novissimam Athenaei editionem. 8vo. 37 pp. Erlangen.
- Aust. Die stadtrömischen Tempelgründungen der Kaiserzeit. 4to. 30 pp. Frankfurt a/m.
- Bacchylides. Poèmes choisis, traduits en vers par E. d'Eichthal et Th. Reinach. Texte grec révisé et notices par Th. Reinach. 4to. viii, 85 pp. Paris, Leroux.
- Poèmes, traduits par A. M. Desrousseaux. 12mo. 124 pp. Hachette. 3 fr.
- Christ (W.) Zu den neu aufgefundenen Gedichten des Bacchylides. 8vo. 52 pp. München.
- Croiset (A.) Quelques mots sur Bacchylides. Suivis de la traduction des deux de ses odes par E. d'Eichthal et Th. Reinach. 8vo. 16 pp. Leroux.
- Bardt (C.) Der Zinswucher des H. Erutus. 4to. 8 pp. Berlin.
- Bauer (W.) Der ältere Pythagoreismus. 8vo. 228 pp. Bern.
- Blass (Friedr.) Die attische Beredsamkeit. Part III. Subdivision II. Demosthenes' Genossen und Gegner. Second edition. 8vo. vi, 422 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 12 Mk.
- Blaydes (F. H. M.) Adversaria in varios poetas graecos ac latinos. 8vo. viii, 202 pp. Halle, Waisenhaus. 4 Mk.
- Borchardt (L.) Bericht über die Corrosion des Sandsteinmaterials der Tempelbauten auf Philae. 8vo. 13 pp., 11 engravings. Berlin.
- Breitner (Ant.) Juvaviae rudera. Römische Fundstätten im Salzburger Flachgan. 8vo. 18 pp., 5 plates. Leipzig, Baum. 1 Mk.
- Brunn (Heinr.) Kleine Schriften, gesammelt von Herm. Brunn und Heinr. Bulle. Vol. I. Römische Denkmäler. Altitalische und etruskische Denkmäler. 8vo. xiii, 277 pp., portr. and 65 engravings. Leipzig, Teubner. 10 Mk.
- Bruns (Ivo.) Die Persönlichkeit der Geschichtsschreibung der Alten. Untersuchungen zur Technik der antiken Historiographie. 8vo. viii, 102 pp. Berlin, Besser. 2 Mk. 40.
- Buchheim (E. W.) Beiträge zur Geschichte des delphischen Staatswesens. I. 4to. 26 pp. Freiberg.
- Burger jr. (C. P.) Der Kampf zwischen Rom und Samnium, bis zum vollständigen Siege Roms um 312 v. Chr. 8vo. 80 pp., 2 maps. Amsterdam, J. Müller. 2 Mk. 25.
- (Aus 'Verhandelingen der k. Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam.')
- Caesaris (Julii) belli civilis libri III, rec. A. Holder. 8vo. viii, 252 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 10 Mk.
- Carter (J. B.) De deorum romanorum cognominibus quaestiones selectae. 8vo. 64 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk.
- Catullus. Rassfeld (F.) Die Stellung der Negation non bei Catull. 4to. 9 pp. Hoxter.
- Christ (Wilh.) Geschichte der griechischen Literatur bis auf die Zeit Justinians. 3rd edition. 8vo. xiii, 945 pp. 28 engravings. (Müller's Handbook der Altertumswissenschaft, vol. vii.) München, Beck. 16 Mk. 50.
- Cicero. Gurlitt (L.) Textkritisches zu Ciceros Briefen. 4to. 16 pp., 1 engraving. Steglitz.
- Hoyer (R.) Die Urschrift von Cicero de officiis I-III. 4to. 24 pp. Kreuznach.
- Strengé (J.) Einige Bemerkungen zu Ciceros Rede pro Sulla. 4to. 25 pp. Parchim.
- Clemens Alexandrinus. Faye (E. de) Clément d'Alexandrie. Etudes sur les rapports du christianisme et de la philosophie grecque au IIe siècle. 8vo. iv, 324 pp. Paris, Leroux.
- Demosthenes. Schefczik (H.) Ueber den logischen Aufbau der ersten und zweiten olynthischen Rede des Demosthenes. 8vo. 16 pp. Troppan.
- Tvaruzek (J.) Zur Composition der XLIV. Rede des Demosthenes: 'ἔπος Δεωχάρη περί τοῦ

- Ἀρχαίου κληροῦ*. 8vo. 13 pp. Mähr.-Weisskirchen.
- Domanski* (B.). Die Lehre des Nemesius über das Wesen der Seele. 8vo. 40 pp. Münster.
- Dressler* (F.). Constructionwechsel und Inconcinuität bei den römischen Historikern. 8vo. 21 pp. Wien.
- Eichner* (E.). Die lateinische Grammatik und die Satzlehre. 8vo. 79 pp. Inowraslaw.
- Empedocles*. Diels (H.). Ueber die Gedichte des Empedocles. (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der k. preuss. Academie der Wissensch.'). 8vo. 20 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 1 Mk.
- Eugippii Vita Severini*, denuo recogn. Theo. Mommsen. Accedit Tabula Norici. (Scriptores rerum germanicarum in usum scholarum recusi.) 8vo. xxxii, 60 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 1 Mk. 60.
- Eunapius*. Lundström (Vilelm.). Prolegomena in Eunapii vitas philosophorum et sophistarum. (Humanistika Vetenskaps Samfundet i Upsala.) 8vo. 35 pp. Upsala. 90 Pf.
- Euripides*. Oeri (J.). Die euripideischen Verszahlensysteme. 4to. 34 pp. Basel.
- Faustus*. Rehling (B.). De Fausti Reiensis epistula tertia. 8vo. 53 pp. Münster.
- Fritzsche* (G.). Geschichte Platais bis zur Zerstörung der Stadt durch die Thebaner im vierten Jahrhundert v. Chr. 4to. 28 pp. Bautzen.
- Froben* (C.). Zur Lehre vom Prädikativum. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Kernschen Satzlehre. 8vo. 42 pp. Königsberg.
- Fröhner* (W.). Choix de monuments antiques avec texte explicatif. La Collection Tyskiewicz. 6th (last) part. Folio. pp. 39-46, 8 plates. München, Bruckmann. 20 Mk.
- Furtwängler* (Adf.). Griechische Originalstatuen in Venedig. (Aus 'Abhandlungen der k. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften.'). 4to. 42 pp., engravings, 7 plates. München, Franz. 5 Mk.
- Galenus*. Müller (J. v.). Ueber die dem Galen zugeschriebene Abhandlung *περί τῆς ἀπιστίας αἰσθήσεως*. 8vo. 110 pp. München.
- Pohlenz (M.). Quemadmodum Galenus Posidonium in libris de placitis Hippocratis et Platonis secutus sit. 8vo. 42 pp. Berlin.
- Gasquet* (A.). Essai sur le culte et les mystères de Mithra. Crown 8vo. 115 pp. Colin. 2 fr.
- Gemoll* (W.). Kritische Bemerkungen zu lateinischen Schriftstellern. II. 8vo. 32 pp. Liegnitz.
- Golling* (J.). Einleitung in die Geschichte der lateinischen Syntax I. Die lateinische Syntax bei den römischen Grammatikern. 8vo. 10 pp. Wien.
- Gonperz* (T.). Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung griechischer Schriftsteller. 8vo. 29 pp. Wien.
- Grabreliefs* (Die attischen), herausgegeben von Alex. Conze. Part 10. Royal folio. Pp. 243-262, engravings and 25 plates. Berlin, Spemann. 60 Mk.
- Haug* (F.) und *Siet* (G.). Die römischen Inschriften und Bildwerke Württembergs. Vol. I. 8vo. 128 pp., engravings. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 3 Mk.
- Homer*. Becker. Die Vorgeschichte zur Haupt-handlung der Ilias. 4to. 29 pp. Neu-Strelitz.
- Ludwig (A.). Ueber das schwanen der localen darstellungen in der Ilias. (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der k. böhm. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.'). 8vo. 20 pp. Prag, Rivnáč. 40 Pf.
- Wessely (K.). Die Leseezeichen der Ilias-Handschrift  $\pi^h$ . 8vo. 20 pp. Wien.
- Horatius Werke*, herausgegeben von O. Henke und C. Wagener. Vol. II. Satiren und Episteln, von O. Henke. Einleitungen. Text. 8vo. vi, 212 pp. Bremen, Heinsius. M. 2. 20.
- Homer*. Henke (Osk.). Einführung in die Metrik der Horatischen Gedichte. 8vo. 22 pp. Bremen, Heinsius. 60 Pf.
- Hamelbeck, (W.). Ausgewählte Oden des Horaz. Im Versmasse der Urschrift ins Deutsche übertragen. 4to. 30 pp. Mülheim.
- Staedler (K.). Horaz' zeitgeschichtliche Oden in Reimstrophen verdeutscht. Mit einer Uebersicht der Ereignisse während Horaz' Lebenszeit, 689-746 d. St. (65-8 v. Chr.). 4to. 27 pp. Berlin.
- Isaeus*. Les plaidoyers d'Isée, traduits en français avec arguments et notes par R. Dareste et B. Haussoullier. Crown 8vo. x, 239 pp. Paris, Larose. 3 fr. 50.
- Isocrates*. Vasold (J.). Ueber das Verhältnis der isokrateischen Rede *περί ἀριστείας* zu Platons Apologia Socratis. 8vo. 76 pp. Erlangen.
- Koester* (H.). Ueber den Einfluss landschaftlicher Verhältnisse auf die Entwicklung des attischen Volkscharakters. 4to. 17 pp. Saarbrücken.
- Kohlmann* (W.). De vel imperativo quatenus ab aut particula differat. 8vo. 98 pp. Marburg.
- Körber* (K.). Römische Inschriften des Mainzer Museums. 8vo. 66 pp. Mainz.
- Králíček* (A.). Die Donauvölker Altgermaniens. Nach Cornelius Tacitus und Claudius Ptolemaeus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschen Völkerbewegung. 8vo. 38 pp. Brünn.
- Limes* (Der obergermanische-rätische) des Römerreiches, herausgegeben von O. v. Sarwey und F. Hettner. Part IX. 4to. 35 pp., 8 plates, 1 map. Heidelberg, Petters. 5 Mk.
- Livius*. Sanders (H. A.). Die Quellencontamination im 21. und 22. Buche des Livius. I. 8vo. 51 pp. München.
- Zingerle (A.). Zur 4. Decade des Livius. III. 8vo. 10 pp. Wien Gerold. 40 Pf.
- (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der k. Akademie der Wissenschaften.')
- Lochs* (H.). Die *ἀριστείας* oder der sogenannte Vermögenstausch. 8vo. 32 pp. Bielitz.
- Lohan* (E.). Poesis melicae generum nominibus quae vis subiecta sit a classicisscriptoribus Graecis. I. 4to. 36 pp. Lauban.
- Lucian*. Sorof (G.). Vindiciae Lucianae. 4to. 15 pp. Halle.
- Lurz* (G.). Ueber die Heimat Pseudoisidors. 8vo. 77 pp. Erlangen.
- Menander*. Geffcken (J.). Studien zu Menander. 4to. 20 pp. Hamburg.
- Meyer* (Ed.). Die Sklaverei im Altertum. 8vo. 49 pp. Dresden, Zahn & Jaensch. 1 Mk.
- Musaeus*. Kern (G.). De Musaei Atheniensis fragmentis. 4to. 14 pp. Rostock.
- Nepos*. de la Chaux (G.). Der Gebrauch der Verba und ihrer Ableitungen bei Nepos. 4to. 12 pp. Gumbinnen.
- Neumann* (F.). Verzeichnis der auf Aussprache und Rechtschreibung bezüglichen Eigentümlichkeiten in den Inschriften aus Gallia Narbonensis. 8vo. 25 pp. Pola.
- Parthenius Nicaensis*. Mayer-G'schrey (R.). Parthenius Nicaensis quale in fabularum amatoriarum breviario dicendi genus secutus sit. 8vo. v, 69 pp. Heidelberg, Winter. 2 Mk.
- Plato*. Häbler (T.). Ueber zwei Stellen in Platons Timaeus und im Hauptwerke von Copernicus. 4to. 26 pp. Grimma.
- Meissner (J.). Erläuterung und Würdigung des Urteils Platons über die Sophistik. 4to. 15 pp. Solingen 1898.
- Polzl (G.). Die Beweise der Unsterblichkeit der Seele in Platons Phädon. 8vo. 31 pp. Marburg.

- Plato*. Susemihl (F.) Neue platonische Forschungen. I. 8vo. 56 pp. Greifswald.
- Plantus*. Leo (F.) *Analecta Plantina de figuris sermonis*. II. 8vo. 40 pp. Göttingen.
- Plinius*. Rück (K.) Die *Naturalis historia* des Plinius im Mittelalter. Excerpte daraus auf den Bibliotheken zu Lucca, Paris und Leiden. 8vo. iii, 118 pp., 1 facsimile plate (Codex Vossianus M. 69 der Leidener Universitätsbibliothek, Blatt 45). München, Franz. 2 Mk.
- (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der k. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften'.)
- Plutarch*. Schoene (A.) *Plutarchi vita Solonis pars altera, apparatus critico instructa et recognita*. 8vo. 32 pp. Kiel.
- Polybius*. Wunderer (C.) *Polybios-Forschungen*. Beiträge zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte. Part I. Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten bei Polybios auf Herkunft und Bedeutung hin untersucht. 8vo. vii, 123 pp. Leipzig, Dieterich. 2 Mk. 80.
- Ravisius Textor*. Vodoz (J.) *Le théâtre latin de Ravisius Textor 1470—1524*. I. 8vo. 64 pp. Winterthur.
- Recueil des inscriptions juridiques grecques*. Texte, traduction, commentaire, par R. Dareste, B. Haussoullier et Th. Reinach. 2de Série. I. Fascicule. 8vo. v, 186 pp. Leroux.
- Riggauer* (H.) *Zur kleinasiatischen Münzkunde*. 8vo. 11 pp. München.
- Rindfleisch* (G.) *Die Landschaft Hauran in römischer Zeit und in der Gegenwart*. 8vo. 54 pp., 1 map. Marburg.
- Ritter* (H.) et L. Preller, *Historia philosophiae graecae. Testimonia auctorum collecta notisque instructa*. Editio viii. cur. Ed. Wellmann. 8vo. v, 598 pp. Gotha, F. A. Perthes. 10 Mk.
- Robert* (C.) Die Knöchelspielerinnen des Alexandros. Nebst Excursen über die Reliefs auf der Basis der Nemesis von Rhamnus und über eine weibliche Statue der Sammlung Jacobsen. (21. Hallisches Winckelmannsprogramm.) 4to. 35 pp., 8 engravings, 1 plate. Halle, Niemeyer. 4 Mk.
- Rossberg* (K.) *Lateinische Scripta im Anschluss an Cicero pro Roscio Amerino und Livius XXI. XXII*. 8vo. 20 pp. Hildesheim.
- Rossi* (Salv.) *Il mito di Amphiarao nella letteratura e nell'arte figurata. Parte I*. 8vo. 99 pp. Firenze. 2 Lire 50.
- Sallust*. Kunze (Alfr.) *Sallustiana. Part III. Zur Stilistik*. Vol. ii. Die Stellung, Wiederholung und Weglassung der Praepositionen. 8vo. xiv, 352 pp. Leipzig, Simmel. 7 Mk. 50.
- Schanz* (Mart.) *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk Justinians*. Vol. I. Die römische Litteratur in der Zeit der Republik. 2nd ed. 8vo. xviii, 421 pp. (Müller's Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, vol. viii., Part I.) München, Beck. 7 Mk. 50.
- Schmid* (Geo.) *De aquila, quae apud Horatium carm. iv, 4, de ai. aiyoviq, columba, ἀρπυ, quae aves apud Homerum inveniuntur, ratione historiae naturalis, habitu*. 8vo. 29 pp. St. Petersburg, Ricker. 1 Mk.
- Schmitt* (J.) *Ueber phonetische und graphische Erscheinungen im Vulgärgriechischen*. 8vo. 36 pp. Leipzig.
- Schneider* (A.) *Die neuesten römischen Ausgrabungen in der Schweiz*. 8vo. 32 pp., 6 plates. Zürich, Schulthess. 2 Mk.
- Schütze* (K. P.) *Beiträge zur Erklärung der römischen Elegiker*. II. 4to. 27 pp. Berlin.
- Schumacher* (K.) *Die Kastelle bei Neckarburken*. (Aus 'Der obergermanisch-raetische Limes des Römerreiches'.) 4to. 35 pp., 8 plates. Heidelberg, Petters. 7 Mk. 50.
- Schurz* (W.) *Die Militärreorganisation Hadrians*. II. 4to. 32 pp. Gladbach.
- Seneca*. Müller (Mich.) *In Senecae tragoediae quaestiones criticae*. 8vo. 58 pp. Berlin, Mayer and Müller. 1 Mk. 50.
- Sophocles*. Corssen (P.) *Die Antigone des Sophokles, ihre theatrale und sittliche Wirkung*. 4to. 36 pp. Berlin.
- Steinmann* (A.) *De Parthis ab Horatio memoratis. Quaestiones chronologicae*. 8vo. 46 pp. Berlin.
- Stengel* (P.) *Die griechischen Kunstaltertümer*. 2nd ed. 8vo. viii, 228 pp., 5 plates. (Müller's Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, Vol. v. Part III.) München, Beck. 5 Mk.
- Tacitus*. Les Annales (livres i, ii, iii.), expliquées littéralement, annotées et revues pour la traduction française par M. Malterne. 12mo. 188 pp. Hachette. 6 fr.
- Thieme (O.) *De sententiis gravibus et amoenis, quae in scriptis Cornelii Taciti passim reperuntur. Fasciculus primus. Continet annalium libros I.—XIV*. 4to. 30 pp. Berlin.
- Teichmüller* (F.) *Grundbegriff und Gebrauch von auctor und auctoritas*. II. 4to. 36 pp. Wittstock.
- Tertullian*. Kroymann (E.) *Die Tertullianische Uebersetzung in Italien*. 8vo. 34 pp. Wien.
- Thiele* (Geo.) *Antike Himmelsbilder. Mit Forschungen zu Hipparchos, Aratos und seinen Fortsetzern und Beiträgen zur Kunstgeschichte des Sternhimmels*. Royal 4to. viii, 184 pp., 72 engravings, 7 plates. Berlin, Weidmann. Mk. 20.
- Tibull*. Friedrich (G.) *Zu Tibull und Lygdamus*. 4to. 11 pp. Schweidnitz.
- Urkunden* (Aegyptische) aus den kgl. Museen in Berlin. Herausgegeben von der Generalverwaltung. Griechische Urkunden. Vol. ii. Part 12. Indices and additions. Imp. 4to. iii. pp. and pp. 353—399, 2 facsimile plates. Berlin, Weidmann. 2 Mk. 40.
- the same. Vol. iii. Part 1. Imp. 4to. 32 leaves. Same publisher. 2 Mk. 40.
- Vergil*. Irmischer (E.) *Im Königssaal bei Dido. Frei dramatisch bearbeitet nach dem I. Buche der Aeneide*. 4to. 8 pp. Dresden.
- Jahn (P.) *Die Art der Abhängigkeit Vergils von Theokrit*. 4to. 25 pp. Berlin.
- Knorr (A.) *Beiträge zur Erklärung einiger Stellen der Aeneide*. 4to. 27 pp. Belgard.
- Verrius Flaccus*. Willers (H.) *De Verrio Flacco glossarum interprete disputatio critica*. 8vo. 44 pp. Halle.
- Wackernagel* (J.) *Vermischte Beiträge zur griechischen Sprachkunde*. 4to. 64 pp. Basel.
- Xenophon*. Dahmen (J.) *Quaestiones Xenophontae et Antistheneae*. 8vo. 60 pp. Marburg.